

FBIS**DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS***Soviet Union*

Vol III No 174

7 September 1983

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S. 'Poisoning' Talks with KAL 'Provocation'	AA 1
[Kobysh in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 7 Sep]	
U.S. 'Alone' Responsible for Reaching INF Accord	AA 2
[Zhukov in PRAVDA 5 Sep]	
'Obstructionist' U.S. INF Stance Excoriated	AA 5
[Kornilov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 3 Sep]	
Soviet Space Weapons Ban Proposal Lauded	AA 7
[Bratislava PRAVDA 3 Sep]	
Stockholm 'Security' Conference Opening Cited	AA 9
'Security for All'	AA 9
Zagladin Addresses Conference [Vukolov]	AA 10
Zagladin Discusses Results	AA 11
[Ryzhnikov in IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]	
KAL Incident, Soviet Subs Discussed [Stockholm]	AA 11

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gromyko Visits Madrid for Final CSCE Stage	CC 1
Gromyko's Departure From Moscow	CC 1
Gromyko's Arrival in Madrid	CC 1
U.S., Maltese Obstructions	CC 1
[Bovin in IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]	
Debate in UN Security Council Reported	CC 2
U.S., USSR Delegates Speak	CC 2
Soviet Reply Detailed	CC 3
Polish Delegates Supports USSR	CC 4

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Commentary on Reagan 'Slander' Over KAL Incident	A 1
'Pathological Anti-Communism'	A 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Sep]	
'New Brinkmanship'	A 3
[Sturua in IZVESTIYA 7 Sep]	
'Important Questions' Remain [Kalyagin]	A 6
'Blasphemy,' 'Web of Lies'	A 8
[Kornilov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Sep]	
U.S. Media Reports Cited	A 8
[Palladin in IZVESTIYA 7 Sep]	
World Press Reviewed	A 9
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Sep]	
KAL Incident 'Planned, Provocative Violation'	A 11
[Korionov in PRAVDA 7 Sep]	

NORTHEAST ASIA

USSR Government Statement on 'Intruder Plane'	C 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Sep]	
PRAVDA Analyzes S. Korean 'Provocative' Flight [Zakharov, 7 Sep]	C 3
Air Defense Forces on Reaction to 'Incursion'	C 6
Col Gen S. Romanov Interviewed	C 6
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Sep]	
Air Defense Forces Command	C 8
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 7 Sep]	
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Carries Letters on Plane Incident [6 Sep]	C 10
U.S. Accounts of Aircraft Incident Disputed	C 10
Reagan, USSR Statements Contrasted [Kalyagin]	C 10
'Discrepancies' in U.S. Account	C 12
Unanswered Questions [Gerasimov]	C 12
Soviet Jurist Justifies Action Over Air Intrusion	C 14
'Maximum Patience' Shown	C 14
Reaction 'Totally Natural'	C 14
Japan Publishes Pilot's Calls to 'Intruding' Jet	C 15
Former KAL Passengers Cited on Lighting Practices	C 16
Japanese, Soviet Trade Unionists Meet in Odessa	C 16
Shalayev Meets Delegates	C 16
Opening Ceremony	C 17
Meeting Closes	C 17
Shultz Urges Japan To Increase Military Buildup [Yegorov]	C 18

SOUTH ASIA

Indian Foreign Minister Arrives for Talks	D 1
Gromyko Welcomes Rao	D 1
Gromyko Holds Talks 5 Sep	D 1
Indian Businessman Cited on Trade Cooperation	D 2
U.S., Pakistan To Expand Military Ties	D 3
Further TASS Coverage on Pakistan Situation	D 3

EASTERN EUROPE

Hungary's Juhar in USSR for Trade, Tourism Talks	F 1
Agreement Signed [MTI]	F 1
Holds Talks; Returns Home [MTI]	F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

W. Europe Reaction to Korean Plane Incident	G 1
UK Media Echo U.S.	G 1
Portuguese Ask Explanation [Lisbon]	G 2
Italians Refuse Aeroflot Service [Rome]	G 2
FRG's Vogel Asks Refusal of New U.S. Weapons	G 2
[PRAVDA 3 Sep]	
Arrests 'Exceeded Need' at FRG Peace Rally	G 3
'Claims' on West Berlin 'At Odds' With Agreement	G 3
[Kabanov in PRAVDA 3 Sep]	
Soviet Navy Conducts Maneuvers in Tyrrhenian Sea [Rome]	G 4
Maltsev Fetes Swedish Envoy De Geer on Departure	G 4
[IZVESTIYA 4 Sep]	

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Soviet Reportage Focuses on U.S. Role in Lebanon	H 1
Full Cooperation With Israel	H 1
[Vinogradov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Sep]	H 1
U.S. 'Expanding Interference'	H 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Sep]	
Sinking Into 'Lebanese Quagmire'	H 4
[Kudryavtsev in IZVESTIYA 4 Sep]	
Lebanese Press Carries 'Lies' About USSR Policy	H 6
Egyptian Opposition Leader on U.S. in Lebanon	H 7

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

PRAVDA Hits French 'Role' in U.S. Plans in Chad	J 1
[Shchedrov, 3 Sep]	
France Defends Own, U.S. Interests in Chad [Bovin]	J 3
CPSU Delegation's Talks in Dar es Salaam Noted	J 5
[PRAVDA 31 Aug]	

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Weinberger C. America Trip to 'Escalate' War [Fesunenکو]	K 1
Cuban Rebels Seen as 'CIA Secret Army'	K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Kapitonov Attends Moscow Book Fair Opening	R 1
CPSU Tightening Discipline, Efficiency Standards	R 1
[Editorial in PRAVDA 2 Sep]	
Briefs: New Lithuanian City; Order of Labor Red Banner	R 2

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Higher Pay for Technical Workers Discussed	S 1
Disproportion Seen in Productivity, Remuneration	S 1
[Voznesenskiy]	
Council of Ministers Adopts Decision on Energy	S 2
Briefs: Urengoy-Uzhgorod Pipeline Completed	S 2

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

SELSKAYA ZHIZN Surveys Feed Harvest Progress [2 Sep]	T 1
CSA Reports Ryazan Oblast Grain Crop Fulfillment	T 2

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Science Academy President Discusses Achievements	U 1
Briefs: Riga Television, Radio Complex	U 1

U.S. 'POISONING' TALKS WITH KAL 'PROVOCATION'

PMO61315 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 7 Sep 83 p 9

[Article by Vitaliy Kobyshev under the rubric "Observer's Opinion": "Let's Speak Plainly"]

[Text] Everyone, absolutely everyone, who understands the gravity of the situation which has formed in the world, and primarily the Europeans, will follow with heightened attention the Geneva talks on nuclear arms in Europe, which have now resumed their work.

How to assess the prospects of the Geneva dialogue? If we are speaking of the crux of the matter, there is a perfectly realistic basis for the successful conclusion of the talks between the USSR and the United States and for reaching an agreement which would lead to the gradual reduction of the nuclear arsenals on earth and then their total liquidation. The constructive new proposals put forward by Yu.V. Andropov in his replies to PRAVDA's questions -- they are well known -- pave a direct path to such an agreement. These proposals show the flexibility of the USSR's position and its consistency and purposefulness in the sacred business of ridding the European peoples of the nuclear threat.

In our readiness to reach an agreement and achieve the elimination of the nuclear peril, we have gone all the way. It is simply impossible to do any more. And specialists in military strategy in the West, including the United States and NATO, are perfectly aware of that. They know that anything over and above this would directly threaten the security of our own country and of the fraternal socialist countries. They know that we will never agree to the absurd proposal that we take no account of the British and French nuclear potential.

I do not doubt that not only analysts with a large amount of objective information, but also sober, sane people understand very well that the Soviet Union has displayed the maximum goodwill and that everything now depends on whether Washington displays the same goodwill.

Let us be frank. Official Washington's first response to the proposals put forward by Yu.V. Andropov not only put us on guard but also create the impression that the U.S. representatives who have come to the Geneva talks have received instructions to totally ignore these proposals of ours and to make no concessions. The U.S. press has published a strikingly frank statement by, it is said, "a high-ranking White House official," unnamed, of course. The Soviet initiatives are running into a blank wall in the White House, he said.

I fear that it is not merely a case of a blank wall but also of more than vigorous actions aimed at hindering the reaching of a Geneva accord and thus, as it were, opening up a "legal" path for the deployment of the U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles in West European countries. So far the opponents of an agreement have embarked on monstrous cheating and outright lies. Now they believe that the time has come for overt acts of subversion and provocation.

The latest unprecedented act of provocation of this kind was the story of the South Korean aircraft which intruded into the Soviet Union's airspace in the Far East. It has already been reported that this aircraft, U.S.-manufactured and manned by military pilots, in some "mysterious" way deviated from its international course by no less than 500 km and, penetrating deep into the USSR's airspace, overflew targets which even U.S. and NATO experts consider to be top secret. It was on course not for Seoul but for Vladivostok.

This Boeing 747, it emerged, was under constant observation by U.S. and Japanese tracking services. The observation was conducted, inter alia, by satellite, from space. It also became known that the CIA did not let the aircraft out of its sight for a minute. Let us add that the Boeing was equipped with ultramodern communications facilities and other technical equipment. What, after that, is the worth of allegations by White House leaders that this was all nonetheless merely "an accident," "an error"? When several years ago another South Korean aircraft overflew targets of strategic importance on different Soviet territory -- the Kola Peninsula -- what was that, another accident?

That is the modus operandi of the CIA, for whom human lives mean nothing. U.S. President Reagan, Secretary of State Shultz, and others are now shouting until they are blue in the face that it was a civilian aircraft, that there were civilians on board. Just so. That is the horror of it: Aware of this, the U.S. special services used the aircraft for their own dirty deeds. Washington leaders are shouting until they are blue in the face, accusing the Soviet Union of every mortal sin. Yet they themselves are great sinners who may perhaps never achieve absolution. We, like any self-respecting state, are no more than concerned for our sovereignty, which no one is allowed to violate.

It is now clear that the aim of this whole act of provocation was not only once more to discredit the Soviet Union and socialism but also to poison (to a far greater extent!) the international atmosphere. They proceed from the premise that the worse the world atmosphere, the better the situation for implementing U.S. and NATO imperialist plans and the easier it is for them to deviate from agreements on halting the arms race to rid mankind of the nuclear threat.

That is the climate which Washington is deliberately creating at a moment when the talks on which a very great deal depends, not only for the Europeans but also for all people on earth, are being resumed in Geneva.

As for the Soviet Union, it will do everything in its power to ensure that mankind receives good news from Geneva.

U.S. 'ALONE' RESPONSIBLE FOR REACHING INF ACCORD

PMO61652 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 83 First Edition p 6

[PRAVDA Political Observer Yu. Zhukov article carried in feature under the heading "Reason Against Madness": "The Hour of Responsibility; The Latest Round of the Geneva Talks"]

[Text] The latest round of the Soviet-American talks whose aim is officially designated as the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe begins in Geneva on 6 September.

The language of diplomats is precise, but dry and free of emotion, and even a little while ago reports on these meetings could have left many people indifferent. But today life itself suggests to everyone that their own fate, the fate of their children, the fate of their aged parents, and in the end the fate of the whole human race depends to a tremendous extent on the outcome of the Geneva talks.

The question, so to speak, is a blunt one:

-- Either Europe gets rid of the many hundreds of units of medium-range nuclear weapons, which is what the Soviet Union is proposing, and peace in Europe and throughout the planet will then strengthen and people will breathe more freely;

-- Or the American generals, ignoring the peoples' will, will forcibly place hundreds of their metal monsters among the fields and orchards of Western Europe and alongside its cities, and the military threat will then grow sharply.

Naturally, the Soviet Union in this event will inevitably have to take countermeasures. As the recent CPSU Central Committee Politburo session remarked, "If some people are counting on achieving superiority over the USSR in an atmosphere of tension, it is a dangerous miscalculation." The balance of forces will be maintained on regional, European, and global scales.

But the Soviet Union was, is, and will remain opposed to the nuclear arms race. After all, it is clear to everyone, even people not versed in the nuances of military problems, that the more nuclear missiles there are, the more real becomes the possibility that at some moment, either through the malevolence of some American "crusader" in military uniform who has gone crazy with anticommunist hatred, or even accidentally -- for example, through computer error -- one of the metal monsters will take off and with its savage roar herald the death of tens or even hundreds of thousands of people. And then there will be no opportunity for talks.

For the time being the possibility of avoiding a new and most dangerous round in the nuclear missile arms race still exists. The midnight hour has not yet struck. But time is disappearing with incredible speed and the hour is drawing near. That is why people everywhere today are listening tensely to the news from Moscow and Washington: What are their representatives taking with them to Geneva? What sort of political baggage are they taking with them?

The implementation of the program proposed by the Soviet Union would ensure the strictest equality of nuclear weapons on each side and, moreover, equality at a level three times lower than at present, in terms of missiles, aircraft, and warheads.

The latest, manifestly farfetched arguments of the opponents of this program have been debunked by the new Soviet initiative set forth in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's answers to questions from PRAVDA.

As soon as the new Soviet initiative became known in the United States, President R. Reagan was bombarded by journalists' questions: How was he going to respond to it? The President brushed them aside, alleging that he "had not seen the text" of the new Soviet proposals. But meanwhile the State Department prepared a statement in which, in response to these proposals, he repeated the old, long since exposed "zero option" stance -- zero missiles for the USSR, and zero reductions for the United States and NATO!

The American side's stance remains unchanged. It contains, as before, deliberately unacceptable demands aimed at breaking the military parity existing in Europe, at the USSR's unilateral disarmament, and at the achievement of American military superiority.

It is no wonder that such a diehard and truly provocative stance has met with a sharp rebuttal not only among participants in the rapidly developing peace movement but also in circles which are distant from it.

On 28 August the well-known American political observer J. Reston, commenting on the antiwar demonstration by the 400,000 participants in the march on Washington, bitterly acknowledged that confrontation in the United States between the Reagan administration, which is supported by extremely reactionary, belligerent organizations like the American Legion, and the broadest people's masses is deepening.

Recalling that the President interrupted his vacation to speak at the American Legion convention in Seattle but declined to meet with peace march participants, J. Reston reproachfully observed: "Earlier this week he described the participants in the demonstration protesting against his policy in the nuclear arms field as representatives of the 'so-called peace movement,' and they considered this an insult. It is not surprising: How would Reagan himself react if he were termed a 'so-called President'?"

The peoples do not accept the American side's false claims that the allegedly "independent" British and French arms "cannot" be taken into account when determining the balance of nuclear forces in Europe. "Many people in Western countries cannot see the reason for excluding them from the total count," Britain's THE GUARDIAN wrote on 29 August. "The Soviet Union is opposed by three hostile powers possessing nuclear weapons ... whereas for the members of the Western alliance there is only one opponent."

And if anybody still harbored any doubts as to whom the "world's third largest nuclear arsenal," belonging to France, is aimed at, these were dispelled, as the influential American newspaper THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR pointed out, by Colonel Gilles (Zhongles) de (?Lin), deputy commander of the French missile base on the Albion Plateau. While showing journalists the reinforced concrete launching silos the bellicose commander coolly declared: this is sufficient to strike against Moscow and all the major targets in the western part of the Soviet Union's territory.

And, after all, as THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR observed, you still have to add to this the French nuclear submarines, which "could ensure the destruction of 50 million people," and the Mirage nuclear bombers. How dare American diplomats demand that we close our eyes to the French nuclear forces, and even more so to the British nuclear weapons, which are directly incorporated in the NATO system?

Putting forward this demand is tantamount to sabotaging the talks, and the millions of people who are closely following what is happening in Geneva cannot fail to see this. They cannot fail to see that the Soviet Union has shown a constructive and flexible approach throughout these talks and has put forward one realistic proposal after another. They cannot fail to see, either, that any of these proposals is at first accepted for examination, then called into question, and finally shelved.

People in the United States and in Western Europe, who receive scant news about the course of affairs in Geneva, are concerned: They are beginning to appreciate that this method of conducting the talks leads to a dead end. Washington's leaders have drummed into everybody's ears that they are, or so they claim, adopting a flexible stance, and that it is the insufferable Russians who do not wish to lift a finger to reach an agreement and want one thing only -- a monopoly of nuclear weapons. But it now turns out that the situation is quite the contrary!

And the deceived people are beginning to boil with rage: How is it possible for figures vested with power, who occupy the highest posts in the United States, to smile at the television cameras and tell a deliberate untruth in their well-trained orators' voices! It turns out that it is possible. It turns out that for the sake of the mercenary interests of the military-industrial complex these figures are capable of anything.

But there's no escaping the inevitable. The hour of responsibility and serious decisions is striking, the hour when the American side will no longer be helped by cheap propaganda devices and will have to explain its stance to the whole world. The peoples are putting blunt and precise questions to them on the eve of the decisive round of talks:

"Do you or do you not want an agreement? What are you trying to obtain? You love to speak about the United States' national interests. But what can be higher than the main national interest of the American people and of all the peoples of the world, which is that of removing the threat of nuclear death which looms over the world as a result of your adventurist policy?"

The new Soviet proposals have created a real opportunity to remove this terrible threat from mankind. It now depends on the American side alone whether the door to an agreement is open or closed.

Launching ever more widely their fall peace offensive, the multimillion-strong masses of peace supporters from all countries are loudly declaring their implacable determination to halt the nuclear arms race. And if those who are persisting in their mad adventurist schemes stand in their way, they will be risking a great deal, including their political positions.

The peoples do not forgive their vital interests and rights, the chief of which is the right to live, being consigned to oblivion!

'OBSTRUCTIONIST' U.S. INF STANCE EXCORIATED

PM061117 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 3 Sep 83 p 3

[Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov article under the rubric "View of Events": "Moscow's Goodwill"]

[Text] Moscow's appeals for reason, peace, and the curbing of the arms race resound again and again over the planet with tremendous force! If we generalize the numerous comments issuing from different continents on Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's replies to PRAVDA's questions and highlight the chief, most important point in these comments, there is every reason to say that the Soviet leader's statement, which is principled in nature and touches on a number of cardinal problems of world politics, has rightly been evaluated everywhere as exceptionally weighty and convincing proof of the Soviet country's firm will for peace and as evidence of its unbending determination to remove the threat of nuclear self-immolation.

Soviet people, like millions of people in all countries, now see the accelerated material preparations for war, above all, as the chief source of the military threat hanging over the world. The U.S. ruling circles, which do not think in terms of equality but in terms of superiority, have already set in motion the 5-year plan for the "rearmament of America" on whose implementation they intend to spend more than \$1.5 trillion and which is designed to increase many times over the destructive might of the U.S. military arsenal, including in Europe. The policy of unrestrained arms buildup being pursued by Washington and NATO leads to the disruption of international stability. Their advancement of new military programs is inseparably linked with the escalation of aggressive strategic concepts and doctrines being constructed in Washington, like the doctrine of a "disarming first nuclear strike" and "limited nuclear war," which are based on the illusory calculation that it is possible to win a nuclear duel by being the first to use nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union rejects the very idea of nuclear war as foolhardy and the calls for it as criminal; Soviet foreign policy initiatives today constitute a comprehensive program of measures -- ranging from individual steps in the sphere of limiting arms to general and complete disarmament, including a total ban on and the destruction of nuclear weapons. This principled policy is graphically confirmed by the USSR's major proposals aimed at ensuring the reliable security of the European Continent and securing a positive outcome at the Soviet-American talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe.

Replying to PRAVDA's questions, Yu.V. Andropov emphasized: "In the event of our reaching a mutually acceptable agreement, including U.S. abandonment of the deployment of new missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union, in reducing its medium-range missiles in the European part of the country to a level equal to the number of British and French missiles, would liquidate all the missiles so reduced." "An exceptionally important step," "a graphic manifestation of the USSR's goodwill" -- this is the assessment of the Soviet position made by the peace-loving public of all countries.

But what is the U.S. position? Washington does not stint verbal assurances of its own "love of peace" and zealously publicizes its imaginary "flexibility" at the talks, while in fact continuing to adhere to a negative or, rather, obstructionist line which looks very much like deliberate sabotage. The purport of the notorious American "zero option" is zero missiles for the USSR and zero reductions for NATO. And Washington's so-called "interim option" hinges on attempts to achieve a situation in which the USSR would unilaterally reduce its arsenal of medium-range nuclear means in Europe, while the United States not only would not reduce its corresponding arsenal but would also acquire the "right" to deploy in the Western part of the continent -- in addition to the British and French missiles already there -- new American missiles in numbers equal to the number of remaining Soviet missiles. In other words, it is a question of upsetting in any way and by any means the approximate parity of nuclear forces which has come about between the USSR and NATO, securing the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament, and leaving our country unarmed in the face of hundreds of NATO nuclear missiles. Is there any need to demonstrate that such an approach can be called "flexible" only in terms of a mockery of common sense?

And turning West Europe into a launch site for new American medium-range nuclear weapons would mean creating a threat not only to the socialist countries. Today it is planned to target Pershings, for which the Atlantic hawks are already preparing launch sites in the FRG and other European NATO countries, on the USSR. But the same Pershings, launched from the same sites, could be directed, say, to regions of North Africa or the Near East. Is it possible to give a guarantee that the masters of these Pershings, who are prey to an irrepressible imperial itch and who already publicly proclaim almost the whole world a "sphere of American vital interests," will not one day conceive the intention of using the medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in West Europe to strike, say, at those Arab countries whose policy "does not suit" Washington, and will not use these weapons to suppress the national liberation struggle? And, if not tomorrow, then the day after tomorrow, could those same Pershings not pose a real threat also to some West European state whose "conduct" is "not to the taste" of Washington?

Seeking to provide "propaganda cover" for its aggressive policy, Washington is continuing to inflate in every possible way the malicious fables about "the Soviet Union's aggressiveness" and "Moscow's intrigues." "This campaign," the American communist leader Gus Hall wrote recently in the pages of THE DAILY WORLD, "has sinister aims, for if someone believes the lie about the Soviet threat and the lie that 'the Russians are coming,' he can also be persuaded of the need to support the \$300 billion U.S. military budget, which is taking the country to the brink of bankruptcy and bringing our people undescribable misfortunes."

In short, from whatever angle you approach Washington's plans for the deployment of new medium-range weapons in West Europe, it is more than obvious that these plans, elaborated to the accompaniment of militarist drumbeats, pose a threat not only to Europe. They are a threat to peace, stability and to the very life of people on different continents! The mighty waves of the struggle against Washington's attempts to turn the western part of the European Continent into its nuclear hostage are growing rapidly. The antiwar, antimissile movement is becoming increasingly popular and active. In Britain more than 150 municipal councils have already proclaimed their territories nuclear-free zones. As evidenced by public opinion polls in the FRG, 75 percent of the country's inhabitants oppose the deployment of American Pershing and cruise missiles on West German soil. Demands for the militarists to be curbed and the ruinous and extremely dangerous arms race to be ended are resounding increasingly loudly even in the United States, as graphically confirmed by the recent "march on Washington," in which approximately 400,000 people participated under the slogan "Work, Peace, Freedom!"

The crucial and, what is more, decisive round of the Soviet-American talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe resumes in Geneva in a few days time -- 6 September. The USSR, as previously, will adhere at these talks to a constructive and flexible line, reckoning that the American side will finally change its negative approach.

But if some people in Washington still count on unilateral concessions from the Soviet Union to the detriment of its own security interests, then these are futile, absolutely hopeless calculations. The Washington apologists for the "from a position of strength" policy should remember that the deployment of American Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe would have far-reaching consequences which will inevitably affect also the United States itself.

SOVIET SPACE WEAPONS BAN PROPOSAL LAUDED

AU061205 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 3 Sep 83 p 4

[Interview given by Y. Sadov, "military expert of the USSR Ministry of Defense," to APN military commentator V. Morozov: "Orbit Without Weapons; Let Us Not Allow Outer Space To Become an Arena of Military Rivalry" -- place and date not given]

[Text] [Morozov] Wherein lies the threat of a militarization of outer space?

[Sadov] The development of any space weapons is an extraordinarily dangerous step opening a new direction of the arms race. The stationing of any type of weapons in outer space would inevitably have a destabilizing effect on the strategic situation in the world and would increase the threat of a nuclear war breaking out. The plans to "gain supremacy" in space will cause damage to the security and sovereignty of all states and people on our planet because space weapons would be hovering over them like Damocles' sword.

The militarization of outer space would deepen distrust in relations among states and complicate the international situation. Should such weapons be deployed, the prospect of limiting the arms race in other spheres would become even more remote. An arms race in outer space would, above all, cause enormous damage to the peaceful exploration and use of space. Generally, the likelihood of a nuclear war breaking out would increase. It would be a tragedy for the human race if outer space turned into an arena of military conflicts.

[Mozorov] What has prompted the new Soviet initiatives?

[Sadov] The existing international agreements leave open the possibility of stationing in outer space those types of weapons that do not fall into the category of mass destruction weapons. The United States is trying to take advantage of this as its leadership sees in outer space new possibilities for acquiring military supremacy and global power. The proliferation of American military space programs is disconcerting for everyone because they could destabilize the situation in the world. To break into outer space with weapons -- these are not mere plans but concrete deeds.

The Space Shuttle program, first described as "exclusively peaceful," now pursues military aims. Weapons utilizing guided energy (laser and beam weapons) are being developed, which are to be deployed in outer space. Space, air, as well as ground objects are to become their targets.

The U.S. President has decided to develop a new generation of anti-ballistic missile systems to be deployed in space. The United States is virtually ready to start testing the ASAT anti-satellite system, based on the F-15 fighter-bombers. The structure of bodies involved in military space activities is also being improved. A special space command center has been set up that is to be reorganized into a combined space command for the air force, navy, and ground forces.

Gigantic sums are being earmarked to develop space weapons. The Pentagon has announced its plan to increase its "space budget" by 10 percent a year and to achieve an annual budget of \$14 billion in the next 5 years. Resources earmarked for developing space-based laser systems alone are to increase more than twelvefold by 1988, according to a plan of the U.S. Department of Defense. Work is underway on a new strategy for waging war in space and from space. Outer space is regarded as an arena of military operations.

All this logically alarms the public. Every space weapon, regardless of its distance from the planet, is ultimately directed against the earth. The global problems facing mankind require that outer space be left free of weapons, that it remain in a state of peace. The reply of Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the appeal of a group of American scientists and public officials stresses that "averting the militarization of outer space is one of the most important problems mankind must resolve. A great deal on the earth depends on how it copes with this task."

Concern over the possible militarization of space is also shown by prominent American scientists and politicians. In July, nearly 100 congressmen and more than 40 American scientists called on President Reagan to speedily reach an agreement with the USSR on introducing a bilateral moratorium on testing anti-satellite weapons in space.

The arms race in outer space is extraordinarily dangerous and might lead to the discovery of qualitatively new weapons. The control and limitation of these weapons could run up against insurmountable difficulties. It would be easier to forestall a space arms race than to agree on destroying already existing weapons.

Guided by the endeavor to avert the militarization of space and to keep it forever free of any weapons, the Soviet Union has come up with new extensive proposals in this area.

[Mozorov] What is the gist of the new Soviet proposals?

[Sadov] When he received some American senators, Yu. V. Andropov said that the Soviet Union considers it essential to agree on a complete ban of testing and developing any space-based weapons destined for hitting targets on the ground, in the air, or in space. The USSR is ready to deal with the issue of anti-satellite weapons in the most radical fashion -- it is ready to agree to liquidate already existing anti-satellite systems and to ban the development of new ones.

As a supplement to these proposals, the Soviet state has adopted a very important commitment: It will not be first to launch into space any type of anti-satellite weapons, which means that it has introduced a one-sided moratorium on launching such weapons for as long as other states, including the United States, refrain from launching into space anti-satellite weapons of any sort. The selflessness of this proposal is self-evident. The USSR has made the most important step toward averting an arms race in space. Naturally, we rightly expect the United States to take a similar step.

In its endeavor to prevent the arms race from being carried into outer space, the Soviet Union has proposed that the problem of concluding an agreement on banning the use of force in outer space and from space against the earth be included in the agenda of the 38th session of the UN General Assembly, and has submitted the draft of such an agreement. This draft explains in detail the new Soviet proposals. The draft version of the agreement combines the political-legal commitments of states not to allow the use of force in space against each other with measures of a material nature preventing space from becoming militarized.

The Soviet proposals are specific and unambiguous. They also deal with precision with the problems of verifying the observance of the individual provisions of the agreement. They envisage, above all, the use of national technical control devices, consultations, and cooperation of the participating states, while using the respective international procedures within the framework of the UN in solving all questions that may arise in connection with the objectives of the agreement or in connection with the fulfillment of its provisions. These procedures may also include the use of services provided by the consultative committee of the member states of the agreement. In other words, the Soviet Union proposes the most effective verification measures possible, ranging up to international measures.

The position of the Soviet Union corresponds to the interests of the overwhelming majority of nations and states, which more and more clearly realize the danger hovering over them. Averting an arms race in space is a highly important task, a task requiring solution in the interest of all countries, including the United States.

STOCKHOLM 'SECURITY' CONFERENCE OPENING CITED

'Security for All'

LDO21511 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT 2 Sep 83

[Text] Stockholm September 2 TASS - The international conference on the subject "Security for All" began its work here today. It is held by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. The conference is attended by prominent politicians and public figures, scientists from many countries, including the Soviet Union and a number of other socialist states.

The conference will discuss questions connected with ensuring universal security in the world and with U.S.-Soviet relations, as well as problems of European security.

Zagladin Addresses Conference

LD041117 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 4 Sep 83

[Text] Stockholm September 4 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports:

The Soviet concept of security proceeds from the assumption that in the nuclear age the main and basic condition of ensuring security for every country and every people is to avert nuclear war and to remove the threat of such war, Vadim Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, has said in his address to participants in the international conference "Security for All" here. He pointed out that nowadays the arms race in itself not only is not a means of ensuring security, but actually subverts it and escalates the war threat.

Practice shows, Vadim Zagladin noted, that it is impossible to win the nuclear arms race. Security of any one country cannot be achieved by creating a threat to others. That is why the only acceptable security principle nowadays is to ensure equal security for all countries. The Soviet spokesman outlined the latest peace proposals put forward by Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in his replies to questions from the newspaper PRAVDA.

Egon Bahr, chairman of the Bundestag disarmament and arms control subcommission and member of the presidium of the board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, noted the substantiated character of the USSR position, which takes into account the British and French nuclear missiles in considering the problem of nuclear arms limitation in Europe.

Many participants in the conference voiced worry and concern over the continued aggravation of the situation in different parts of the world. Raul Prebisch, a notable politician and public figure from Argentina who is member of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, criticized the policy of Washington, which is imposing its will on Central American countries. The United States, he said, is acting from positions of economic blackmail and flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of those countries, and is giving support to reactionary dictatorial regimes, which detracts from security in that part of the world.

Trying to justify the U.S. course of whipping up the arms race, in particular, the race in nuclear weaponry, Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defence for International Security Policy, tried to convince participants in the forum that the Soviet Union had military superiority over the United States.

Zagladin Discusses Results

PM061341 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Ryzhnikov report under the rubric "On a Topical Theme": "For the Sake of the Peoples' Security: The Stockholm Conference Has Finished Work"]

[Text] Stockholm -- An international conference on the subject of "Security for All," organized by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), has ended here. Assessing the conference's work and its results, V.V. Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, said in a talk with ZVESTIYA's correspondent:

The conference convened by SIPRI was, in my view, of great significance, first of all, because it was devoted to a very important topic. "Security for All" -- that is so topical in a world full of various conflicts, provocations, and interventions by all more than ever. Second, the level of discussion was very high. Representatives of the scientific world and representatives of governments, including representatives of foreign ministers, took part. So there can be no doubt of the authoritativeness of the discussion. Third, it is important to say that even if there were clashes between different ideas about the modern world, which are sometimes mutually exclusive, these clashes took place in a favorable atmosphere.

Most of the speakers were inclined to support everything that leads to cooperation and to peaceful coexistence and competition between the two systems and came out against military deterrence and the use of force. That is, the majority's sympathies were undoubtedly on the side of a peace-loving line in present-day international relations.

The concept of "security for all" set forth by the Palme commission does not entirely coincide with our ideas of socialist foreign policy, but in the main it accords with the interests of restoring the spirit of detente in international relations, which is very important. This fact was also noted in the local press, which widely publicized the conference's work.

I believe its main result is the following. The conference showed that in the conditions of the existence of and confrontation between different opinions, it is possible to reach a common outcome, common conclusions in favor of peace, given goodwill and an honest desire to face up to the truth.

As a participant in the meeting I was pleased that the Soviet Union's peace initiatives, as set forth, in particular, by Yu. V. Andropov in his interview for the newspaper PRAVDA, are attracting real interest. Very many people see them as a real path toward a possible agreement. This indicates once again that the Soviet foreign policy concept accords with the aspirations of today and truly serves the cause of peace.

KAL Incident, Soviet Subs Discussed

LD041752 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1600 GMT 4 Sep 83

[Text] The conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union caused by the South Korean aircraft affair has to a certain extent marked the atmosphere around the political security conference organized by the peace research institute, SIPRI, in Stockholm. That was noted both at the final press conference today and in the street outside the conference premises. [Brief recording of demonstrators shouting "Soviet murderers."]

A small group of demonstrators gathered outside the government offices in Rosenbad and there greeted the SIPRI conference participants. And the South Korean passenger aircraft was brought up again at the final press conference, and it was, of course, again the Soviet delegate, Vadim Zagladin, who has an important position at the Central Committee's International Department, who was questioned about the aircraft that the United States is accusing the Soviet Union of having shot down deliberately.

Zagladin Maintained that the plane's entry over Soviet territory was not a mistake but a provocation. Mistakes may happen, naturally, he said, but not by flying 2,000 km over Soviet territory and this while under contact with American espionage. It cannot be a coincidence, he suggested, that South Korean civilian aircraft have twice flown far in over Soviet territories -- where, according to military observers in the West, a particularly extensive concentration of intercontinental missiles is said to be located -- [word indistinct] namely over the Kola Peninsula, a few years ago and now over the area around the Sea of Okhotsk.

To a question of whether it is only aircraft which, according to the Soviet view, (?must) respect the borders of other countries, or whether this applies to submarines, too, Zagladin replied: Oh, yes, and Sweden also has the right to defend its borders against intrusion. He dealt just as categorically as other Soviet spokesmen have before that any Soviet submarine should have been in Swedish waters, with the exception of the one near Karlskrona 2 years ago -- a violation due to a technical fault, he said, different from the deviation from the course of the South Korean aircraft. The captain of the submarine has been punished for not having discovered the technical fault, Zagladin was able to report. But he said he did not know what kind of punishment had been imposed.

Zagladin reiterated the Soviet standpoint that the Soviet Union is prepared to discuss a nuclear-free Baltic within the framework of a Nordic zone. We are prepared to sit down to discuss it even today, Zagladin said.

But the most important thing for the Soviet Union just now is the question of how the aircraft disaster will affect relations with the United States. During the past few days both sides have been engaged in polemics using tones resembling the cold war period, in making furious mutual accusations, but it is obviously Moscow which is on the defensive. When I asked Vadim Zagladin how he thought what has happenend will affect relations between the two countries, he replied: It depends on what decisions the United States will take. They are the ones who organized this incident.

Describing the impression made on her by a meeting with the current U.S. President Helen (Koldikott), who heads the organization "Physicians for Social Responsibility," said: My conversation with Reagan frightened me, because it became obvious to me that he seriously believes that the United States can start a nuclear war against the Soviet Union and win. "What guarantee is there that Reagan won't drag us into a war," she wondered.

And many people in the United States are thinking that way. Even John Oakes, former senior editor on THE NEW YORK TIMES, declares: "Ronald Reagan is capable of plunging our country into the most undesirable, imprudent, unnecessary, and unwinnable war in its entire history."

Stopping at nothing, the inspirers of the latest anti-Soviet trumpeting are trying to dictate rules of conduct to our country and to deprive it of the sacred right to defend its own borders.

We reject the accusations and directions from across the ocean. We will not allow our own borders to be violated, and we know how to defend them. Let no one any longer have any doubts on that score. Every provocation is bound to receive and will receive the necessary rebuff. Otherwise things could go too far: If aircraft are allowed onto our territory today, tomorrow it could be missiles.

One wonders: for what purpose was yet another provocation committed against the USSR? The answer is obvious: This is a link in the chain of provocations aimed at exacerbating the international situation that the White House has been pursuing for several years now. Any pretext is used for the purpose -- great or small, from the U.S.-inspired aggression in Lebanon to the aircraft "incident,"

While deliberately driving the talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe into a blind alley and striving, come what may, to deploy the American Pershings and cruise missiles there, the U.S. President is trying to heap the blame for the failure [proval] of the talks onto the Soviet Union. You see, he keeps telling his countrymen and world opinion what the Russians are like: Can we really reach agreement with them?

So, instead of a search for mutual compromise, instead of the real reduction of nuclear arms that the Soviet Union proposes, the public is having impressed on it the ridiculous idea that compromise is impossible. The Soviet Union, the President insists, can only be talked to in the language of force and from positions of military superiority, and hence, he says, it is necessary to arm, arm, and arm again -- which is what the power across the ocean is doing.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand has always believed and continues to believe that compromise is necessary and possible. Our proposals on this score are universally known. As far as the White House bosses' hopes of achieving military superiority over the USSR are concerned, they are illusory. Our great country will not permit that. It will be capable of standing up for itself, of defending its borders and its sovereignty, and of protecting its own and its allies' interests.

USSR GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON 'INTRUDER PLANE'

PM070915 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Sep 83 p 1 Second Edition

["Soviet Government Statement"]

[Text] The TASS statement, published on 2 September of this year on instruction of the Soviet Government, already reported the rude violation of the state frontiers of the Soviet Union by a plane that on the night of 31 August- 1 September intruded into the air space of the USSR over the Kamchatka Peninsula and then in the course of 2 hours had flown over the Sea of Okhotsk and Sakhalin Island. It also mentioned the measures taken by the anti-aircraft defences, both ground and air ones, with the aim of forcing the plane to land at one of the airfields on Sakhalin Island. The subsequent investigation confirmed the earlier mentioned data and supplemented it.

The intruder plane entered the air space over Kamchatka in an area where a most important base of the strategic nuclear forces of the USSR is located. At the same time -- and this is now admitted by the American side -- another spy plane of the United States Air Force, a RC-135, that is similar to it, was in the same area near the Soviet border at the same altitude.

Several Soviet interceptor planes were sent aloft. One of them monitored [kontroliroval] the actions of the American RC-135 plane. A second flew into the area where the intruder plane was and signaled to it that it had intruded into the air space of the USSR. The warnings were ignored.

When it was approaching Sakhalin Island the intruder was again intercepted by fighter planes of the anti-aircraft defenses. And again attempts were made to establish contact with it, including with the help of the known general call signal on the international emergency frequency of 121.5 megacycles. Contrary to the false contentions of the United States President, Soviet anti-aircraft defence fighter planes are outfitted with communication equipment in which this frequency is fixed. So these signals had to be received by the intruder plane, but it did not respond to them. Neither did it respond, as it has been said earlier, to other signals and actions of the Soviet fighter planes.

The Soviet Radio Control Services picked up short coded radio signals transmitted from time to time, such signals that are usually used in transmitting intelligence information.

The anti-aircraft forces command of the area, having analyzed thoroughly the actions of the intruder plane, its route passing also in the area of Sakhalin over military bases, definitively arrived at the conclusion that a reconnaissance aircraft performing special tasks was in the air space of the USSR. We arrived at this conclusion also because of the fact that the plane was flying over strategically important areas of the Soviet Union. The fighter plane made warning shots with tracer shells along the route of the intruder plane. Such a measure is envisaged by international rules.

Since even after this the intruder plane did not obey the demand to fly to a Soviet airfield and tried to evade pursuit, the interceptor-fighter plane of the anti-aircraft defences fulfilled the order of the command post to stop the flight. Such actions are fully in keeping with the Law on the State Border of the USSR which has been published.

The Soviet pilots, in stopping the actions of the intruder plane, could not know that it was a civilian aircraft. It was flying without navigation lights, at the height of night, in conditions of bad visibility and was not answering the signals.

The assertions of the U.S. President that Soviet pilots knew that it was a civilian aircraft are absolutely not in keeping with reality.

Dozens of international air routes pass over Soviet territory. Foreign planes have been flying them for many years and nothing has been happening to them so far as they observe the rules.

We will continue to act in keeping with our legislation, which is fully in accord with international regulations. This wholly applies to the question of ensuring the security of our borders.

It is the sovereign right of every state to protect its borders, in particular, its airspace. This is one of the commonly recognized principles of international law on which relations between states rest. So the U.S. President makes himself out as an ignoramus saying, as he did in his address on 5 September that the Soviet Union "arbitrarily proclaims" its borders in the airspace ['proizvolno obyaryayet" svoi granitsy v vozdushnom prostranstve].

But the point here, of course, is not the ignorance of one U.S. official or another. The point is a deliberate pre-planned action in an area that is strategically important to the Soviet Union. The instigators of that action could not help realizing what its outcome could be, but went ahead with a major intelligence operation with the use, as is now becoming clear, of a civilian plane, deliberately exposing its passengers to mortal danger.

Can anyone imagine anything more cynical than Reagan's statement that no one will ever know how data was fed into the plane's computer that subsequently directed the plane into Soviet airspace to carry out its spying mission. It was not a technical error. The plan was to carry out without a hitch the above intelligence operation, but if it was stymied, to turn all this into a major political provocation against the Soviet Union.

This conclusion is confirmed by all subsequent actions of the U.S. Administration. Its leaders, including the U.S. President, launched a malicious and hostile anti-Soviet campaign over a very short time, clearly using a pre-arranged script. Its essence has been revealed in its most concentrated form in the televised speech of U.S. President R. Reagan on 5 September -- to try to blacken the image of the Soviet Union and discredit its social system, to provoke a feeling of hatred toward the Soviet people, to present the aims of the USSR foreign policy in a distorted perspective, and to distract attention from its peace initiatives.

In a situation when tensions and anti-Soviet hysteria are being whipped up, U.S. leaders would like to evade the solution of major international problems on which the destinies of the peoples depend. And the moment for this provocation has been purposefully chosen. It has been staged precisely now at a time when the question is being solved whether the arms race will be stopped and the threat of nuclear war removed or this threat will keep growing. All indications are, including the mentioned speech of the U.S. President, that the U.S. Administration intends to follow the road of intensifying confrontation with the Soviet Union. R. Reagan's credo, to quote him, is "peace through strength".

No amount of discourse upon "the moral values", "the spirit of humanism", "the value of human life" can cover up such a policy. Can the statesmen of the country that deprived millions of people in Indochina of their lives in a most brutal manner, which, at one with Israeli aggressors, are killing the Lebanese and Palestinians, and whose conscience is burdened with tens of thousands of deaths of Chilean and Salvadoran patriots speak of morality and humanism? The list of crimes committed by American imperialism is a long one and can be continued.

The people on the plane that was used by American special services for their dirty aims fell victim to a fresh crime.

The Soviet Government expresses regret over the death of innocent people and shares the sorrow of their bereaved relatives and friends. The entire responsibility for this tragedy rests wholly and fully with the leaders of the United States of America.

PRAVDA ANALYZES S. KOREAN 'PROVOCATIVE FLIGHT'

PM061623 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Sep 83 p 4 First Edition

[Article by V. Zakharov: "What Lies Behind the 'Incident'"]

[Text] The shameless anti-Soviet hysteria kicked up by the United States around the disappearance of the South Korean aircraft that carried out a provocative flight over Soviet territory for a long period of time on the night ending on 1 September is taking on increasingly unbridled and coarse forms. The coordinated and purposeful character of both the provocative flight itself and the wide anti-Soviet campaign subsequently unleashed by the U.S. Administration is worthy of attention. It is evident that the 'incident' was prepared in advance and that -- judging by what followed -- it was expected. It is also indicative that the first report about the disappearance of the aircraft came from the CIA.

This is not a fortuitous link, but a natural one in the general chain of imperialism's political and other actions in recent times. All of these actions are directed towards widening and deepening the front of the notorious 'crusade' against socialism and are calculated to raise a new wave of anti-Sovietism and anticommunism by any means and discredit the Soviet Union, kindle a feeling of hostility towards it, cast a shadow upon Soviet peace-loving policy, and heat up the situation in the world even more, thereby making it easier to implement the United States' imperialist plans.

Washington's unusually rapid 'reaction' to what took place is characteristic. Just a few hours after the 'incident', U.S. Secretary of State Shultz held an emergency press conference in Washington, which took place in a malicious anti-Soviet spirit. The State Department then made an official statement containing even sharper attacks upon the Soviet Union. The U.S. President himself immediately took charge of the malicious anti-Soviet campaign. His speeches repeatedly contained filthy insinuations against the Soviet Union. At the present time the U.S. mass media are whipping up an anti-Soviet atmosphere by every means and trying to drive new wedges into East-West relations.

Does not all of this reveal the true underlying state of affairs behind the 'incident' that has been provoked and the hysterical noise that has been raised around it? Do not the statements of the U.S. President himself indicate the true purpose and the real meaning of the provocation that has been undertaken? In any event, the facts bear convincing witness to the fact that the South Korean airplane's coarse violation of the Soviet state frontier and deep intrusion into the Soviet Union airspace were a deliberate action, which was planned in advance and pursued far reaching political and military aims.

In this, possible dangerous consequences of the provocative flight were not only ignored, but a diabolical game was deliberately undertaken without regard for the possible human victims. Clearly, the calculation was that the possibility of carrying out reconnaissance flights over Soviet territory without impediment under cover of civil aircraft should be tested in practice: In the event of failure it was to be turned into grounds for slanderous accusations against the Soviet Union.

It is known that the deliberate violation of Soviet state frontiers by U.S. aircraft counting on going unpunished has taken on a systematic character of late. In 1982 such violations took place on 22 February, 13 March, and 4 and 7 May. During this year 12 similar violations have taken place, including violations on 4 April by carrier-based aircraft from the aircraft carriers "Midway" and "Enterprise".

The Soviet Union made official protests on these occasions. However, there was no reaction to them. On the contrary, the level of activity by U.S. reconnaissance aircraft near Soviet air frontiers increased. Furthermore, the Soviet side possesses reliable data that is evidence of the fact that the American special services have started to use civil aircraft on an ever-increasing scale for the fulfilment of reconnaissance tasks. Reconnaissance activity of this kind is also carried out systematically during flights along established corridors. As one may judge, the civil aircraft of other countries, including South Korea, are involved in carrying out particularly risky and provocative tasks. It is evident that this "risk" is not fortuitous, but specially "programmed" -- and not just anywhere, but across the ocean.

Seven flights by U.S. reconnaissance aircraft of the RC-135 type were registered in this region on 31 August of this year, the day before the South Korean airplane's intrusion into the USSR's airspace. A reconnaissance aircraft of this type was observed maneuvering at a height of 8,000 meters in the immediate vicinity of the point where the South Korean aircraft entered the USSR's airspace from 1745 to 2049 Moscow time on 31 August. At the same time, three U.S. warships appeared close to Soviet territorial waters. At 2000 on 31 August Soviet radar stations observed an unknown aircraft with a radar print analogous to the print of the RC-135 800 km northeast of Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy proceeding on a course towards the Kamchatka Peninsula also at a height of 8,000-9,000 meters. Subsequently the Soviet Air Control Service attempted to establish communication with it in order to point out the fact of the violation. However, the aircraft made no reply to the inquiries and continued its flight by the same course, moving more deeply into the USSR's airspace.

Soviet aircraft of the air defenses were sent into the air in order to identify the aircraft and to give it assistance. The violating aircraft made no response to their commands but continued to fly with its air navigational lights extinguished, which is characteristic of flights by U.S. reconnaissance aircraft. The violating aircraft flew over the territory of Kamchatka, including immediately above a Soviet naval base and other military objectives.

As the violating aircraft approached the Sakhalin Island a new group of Soviet air defense aircraft was sent up, which tried again to establish contact with it and to bring it to the nearest Soviet airfield. However, the violator did not merely continue its flight without reacting to the Soviet aircraft's warning maneuver, but, having changed course, entered the airspace over the southern part of Sakhalin and passed over a Soviet air base, at the same time changing altitude [manevriruya po vysote].

It was only after this that warning shots using tracer shells were fired by the Soviet aircraft.

The organizers of the provocation are now trying to confuse the issues. Without denying the fact that Soviet airspace was violated by the South Korean airplane, they are developing the version that the aircraft deviated from its course because of technical failure and was shot down by a Soviet fighter. In confirmation references are made to some kind of "truncated" recording of an interception of radio conversations between the Soviet aircraft and the ground control point.

The facts, however, indicate something else. The Americans were compelled officially to recognise the South Korean aircraft's violation of Soviet airspace and the fact that from the very beginning its flight was under close control throughout the whole of its length. According to a report by the American Broadcasting Corporation from the island of Guam, a message from on board the aircraft was received by the Tokyo flight control center at 2110 on 31 August: "We have passed safely over the south of Kamchatka. The aircraft is maintaining a normal course." This is clear evidence that the aircraft was carrying out a reconnaissance mission.

Why is it that no measures were taken by either the American or the Japanese to cut short the coarse violation of the USSR's airspace and return the aircraft to the international route? Why, too, is it that no attempts were made to communicate with the Soviet side, although there was sufficient time for this?

The argument that the deviation from the course took place allegedly because of technical reasons is also clearly without foundation. According to foreign specialists, aircraft of this type are equipped with precise navigational equipment of the "Omega" system with backup, which completely rules out the possibility of deviations of such a considerable distance. There are five radio systems on the aircraft, one of which has to be permanently tuned to the international frequency.

Moreover, U.S. officials are avoiding replies to all these questions in every possible way.

At a press conference devoted to the "incident" involving the South Korean airplane, which was held following the meeting between President Reagan and the leaders of Congress, White House Press Secretary Speakes was asked about the RC-135 aircraft mentioned in the recording of the Soviet pilots that was in the administration's possession. He stubbornly insisted that there were no references to an RC-135 in that section of the recordings. However, after persistent and repeated questions by a number of correspondents he was compelled -- extremely unwillingly -- to admit that reference was being made to an RC-135 U.S. reconnaissance aircraft that had been in the air at that moment.

The statements made by many foreign figures and specialists note that Kamchatka, the Kuril Islands, and Sakhalin are marked on all air navigation maps as forbidden zones, intrusion into which may lead to opening fire.

The U.S. President is now expressing his "indignation" at what has taken place and is speaking about the "cruelty of the action that has been committed." But surely it was not the Soviet side that planned and implemented this flight? Surely it is the United States and Japan that, in accordance with international norms, bear the responsibility for observing the flight rules and ensuring the flight's safety on an international route that lies within the zone they control? It is also proper to ask how the U.S. side would act if an unidentified aircraft, ignoring all warnings, flew over U.S. strategic objectives that were of vital importance.

On the contrary, extreme restraint was displayed by the Soviet air defense units. If it had been their purpose to destroy the aircraft, as the U.S. representative stated in the Security Council, then this could have been done many times and in a guaranteed way while it was over Kamchatka, without even sending fighters into the air, but using antiaircraft missiles, within range of which the violating aircraft passed.

As is known, the ruling circles of the Soviet Union expressed regret in connection with the human victims and at the same time expressed their resolute condemnation of those who either deliberately or as a result of criminal negligence brought about the deaths of people and now try to use what happened for unscrupulous political purposes.

But the organizers of the filthy anti-Soviet campaign are not letting up. The unusual hullabaloo that has been raised by official Washington, primarily by the upper echelon of the U.S. Administration, around the case of the South Korean aircraft bears witness to the White House's intention to make maximum use of this for its attempts to justify its foreign policy course, which is hostile toward the Soviet Union, for further building up the arms race and for indoctrinating public opinion in Western Europe within the framework of neutralizing antiwar feeling and weakening opposition to the plans for the deployment of medium-range U.S. missiles on the European Continent.

It is known, however, that the policy of blackmail and threats against the Soviet Union has no future. The whole responsibility for the "incident", for the whipping up of tension around it, lies fully upon the United States of America.

AIR DEFENSE FORCES ON REACTION TO 'INCURSION'

Col Gen S. Romanov Interviewed

PM061220 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Sep 83 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with Colonel General S. Romanov, chief of Air Defense Forces Main Staff, by APN observer V. Ostrovskiy: "Provocation With Far-Reaching Aims" -- date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] In connection with the incursion by a foreign plane into the USSR's air space in the region of Kamchatka, the Sea of Okhotsk, and Sakhalin Island on 31 August and the subsequent TASS announcement, APN observer V. Ostrovskiy met with Colonel General S. Romanov, chief of the Air Defense Forces Main Staff, and asked him to describe the circumstances of the violation of the Soviet state border.

Question: In the West the mass media are presenting in a distorted light the instance of the incursion into the USSR's air space by an unidentified aircraft. They want to make public opinion think that the Soviet side is to blame for the loss of this aircraft. How did it all happen really?

Answer: Obviously there is no need to repeat the TASS statement, which sets out in sufficient detail the circumstances of this flagrant violation of the Soviet border. But the point is that the foreign aircraft that invaded our air space flagrantly violated the international rules of civil aviation, including the provisions of the Chicago convention on international civil aviation.

One can only be perplexed as to why the crew of the aircraft, if, as people are now trying to make out, it was on an ordinary flight from New York to Seoul, did not observe the most elementary rules of aviation, which they undoubtedly knew about, otherwise they would not have been allowed to fly. Under the above-mentioned convention (Appendix 2, Flight Rules) in the event of a deviation from course, an aircraft that is intercepted by another aircraft must immediately follow the interceptor's instructions, carrying out and responding to visual signals in accordance with the explanations given in the supplement to this appendix.

Moreover it is not clear why the crew failed to react to their instruments' indications that the plane was not flying over the sea, but over the land of the Kamchatka Peninsula and Sakhalin Island, the more so as planes of this type are equipped with the most modern navigation and radar apparatus with multiple backup systems.

The crew of the intruder plane, which was flying contrary to the standards of the ICAO [International Civil Aviation Organization] with extinguished navigation lights and collision avoidance lights, failed to react to all the actions of our fighter-interceptor, whose pilot made repeated attempts over a long period to lead the intruding plane to the nearest Soviet airfield.

Question: How did the Soviet interceptor plane make these attempts?

Answer: There is a whole series of air and radio procedures laid down by the ICAO Council whereby interceptor planes make it known to the crew of an intercepted aircraft that they have violated another state's air space and have gone off course.

This means, first and foremost, making radio contact with the violator by using a well known general call signal on the emergency frequency of 121.5 megahertz and by means of repeating that call on another emergency frequency. But the Soviet pilot, despite all his attempts to make radio contact with the violator, was unable to do so, since the violator's crew did not respond to the radio signals. The pilot then resorted to maneuvering his aircraft: rolling from wing to wing. And our interceptor was flying with lights on, flashing at the crew of the violator in order to draw their attention to itself. But neither the wagging of the wings nor the flashing of the lights had the necessary result. The violator plane continued its flight at an altitude of 8,000-10,000 meters above the Soviet Union's territory at night.

If this was an ordinary plane, it should have flown along the well known route from New York to Seoul, which passes far from our border and our air space. It must be said that the zone of responsibility for air traffic control (FIR) on this route is divided between the United States and Japan on a line level with the southern tip of Kamchatka in the region of latitude 47 degrees North and longitude 162 degrees East. And American and Japanese air traffic control organs are responsible for each sector of the flight within the sphere of the limits of responsibility within which the flight in question took place. Moreover, it should be added for the benefit of the uninitiated that the crew of the plane carrying out that flight was obliged, on entering a new sector of the air route, to report to ground flight control centers that he is leaving their sector and to request permission from the flight control center (in this case the Japanese center) for permission to enter its sector, as well as requesting information on flying conditions in the next sector of the route zone.

Question: Why did the interceptor pilot open fire?

Answer: Our interceptor pilot fired warning tracer shells along the path of the intruding aircraft to draw the attention of the intruder's crew the gross violation of another state's airspace. This measure is also stipulated in the rules. That is, the firing of authorized weapons parallel to the path of an intruder.

And the invading aircraft's crew must have been perfectly well aware of this. Especially as the Soviet state had distributed to all countries, including the United States and Japan, the provisions of the air navigation information handbook (AIP SSSR) to the effect that an aircraft of a foreign state that has broken the rules of flights over USSR territory can be intercepted by air defense aircraft and forced to land at any airfield at their discretion.

Gromyko's Departure From Moscow

LD061343 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 6 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and foreign minister of the USSR, left Moscow for Madrid today to take part in a meeting of the foreign ministers of the countries participating in the conference on security and cooperation in Europe.

He was seen off at the airport by Mikhail Gorbachev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy foreign ministers of the USSR and other officials.

The seeing-off party also included J.M. Campoamor, charge d'affaires ad interim of Spain in the USSR, and L. Lipatz, charge d'affaires ad interim of France in the USSR. [Spelling of names as received]

Gromyko's Arrival in Madrid

LD062029 Moscow TASS in English 2008 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] Madrid September 6 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR foreign minister, arrived here today to take part in a meeting of foreign ministers of the participating countries of the Madrid meeting.

At the Madrid airport Andrey Gromyko was met by Spain's Deputy Foreign Minister Leoncio Gonzalo Puente Ojea, Spain's Ambassador in the USSR Jose Luis Xifra and other officials.

USSR Ambassador in Spain Y.V. Dubinin was also among the welcoming party.

U.S., Maltese Obstructions

LD061744 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 6 TASS -- The new stage of the Madrid meeting, the follow up of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation, which, it should be hoped, will be the final stage, opens on Wednesday, September 7, political news analyst Aleksandr Bovin writes in IZVESTIYA today.

The Madrid meeting started on November 11, 1980. It opened in the atmosphere when the negative trends in the world politics had been clearly manifested. The Americans openly took the road at confrontation, at replacing a constructive dialogue with accusatory monologues directed against the Soviet Union. By the way, back in June 1980, Ronald Reagan said that while American athletes were asked to boycott the Olympic Games, it would also be better for diplomats to avoid Madrid.

Americans still had to go to Madrid, A. Bovin points out. But they behaved in Madrid very impudently. One got the impression that the U.S. delegation, exploiting the events in Afghanistan, and later in Poland, seeks to torpedo the meeting. But nothing came of its efforts. The Americans actually landed in isolation. European states refused to cross out what has been achieved in Helsinki. The wordings that suited everybody were found in the long run with the active participation of neutral and countries. So it has become possible to approve in principle the balanced text of the final document on July 15.

One question actually remained unsolved, the newspaper writes. Malta's representatives demand the holding of the meeting of experts on problems of the security of the Mediterranean basin. These problems in themselves undoubtedly merit attention. But all the other participants in the meeting came out against Malta's proposal. For what reason? First of all, for the reason that new complex problems, for instance the Middle East, have been added to the exclusively European problems that are also difficult and complex. Second, for the reason that non-European states are automatically included among the participants in the conference. Such overloads might be too great for the Helsinki Conference structure.

A rather delicate situation has formed, IZVESTIYA writes. According to the principle of consensus, a document is regarded as endorsed only if not a single participant in the conference objects to it. Under this approach which is obligatory in the framework in the Helsinki accords, one vote against overweights 34 votes for. Consequently, there is need for agreement. The past weeks in Madrid were devoted precisely to this. Regrettably, the solution acceptable for all had not been found by Monday, the time when this article was written.

The decision will, apparently, have to be made by foreign ministers, the article says.

DEBATE IN UN SECURITY COUNCIL REPORTED

U.S., USSR Delegates Speak

LD062102 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] New York September 7 TASS -- The Reagan administration has used the rostrum of the Security Council to whip up anti-Soviet hysteria over the incident with the plane which invaded Soviet airspace. This aim was pursued by the address of Jeane Kirkpatrick, the U.S. delegate, in the U.N. Security Council. She repeated the American version of the incident, concocted by the CIA, and tried to absolve the U.S. leadership of responsibility for what had happened.

Oleg Troyanovskiy, the Soviet Union's permanent representative to the United Nations, exposed in the Security Council the slanderous allegations about the Soviet Union. It is obvious to everyone, he said, that the U.S. representatives are motivated not by feelings of humanity or concern for safety of air traffic but first and foremost by their anti-Soviet instincts and by a desire to score as many points as possible in psychological warfare against the Soviet Union. Quite symptomatic in this respect was the latest address of the U.S. President with the resultant appeal for fresh appropriations for military purposes and the further escalation of the arms race, mentioning directly such concrete types of weapons of mass destruction as MX missiles.

Facts show that the course and character of the flight of the spy plane were not a chance and that the scenario of that tragic incident had been pre-planned, the Soviet representative stated. The factual aspects of the affair clearly indicate who bears responsibility for the wreck of the South Korean plane, who put at stake the lives of people who became the latest victims of the cold war unleashed by the U.S. Administration.

The Soviet delegation uses the occasion to state anew that the leadership of the Soviet Union regret the loss of human life. At the same time, Oleg Troyanovskiy said, we resolutely denounce those who planned and carried out that inhuman act of provocation and who today try not only to absolve themselves of the guilt but also to exploit what happened for unsavoury political purposes.

Soviet Reply Detailed

LD071215 Moscow TASS in English 1153 GMT 7 Sep 83

[Text] New York September 7 TASS -- Speaking at the U.N. Security Council, U.S. representative Jeane Kirkpatrick repeated the C.I.A.-elaborated U.S. version concerning the provocation involving a South Korean plane and, on instructions from the White House, attempted to free the U.S. leadership from responsibility for the human tragedy that had happened.

Oleg Troyanovskiy, the USSR's permanent representative to the United Nations, exposed the slanderous anti-Soviet campaign, mendacious concoctions in relation to the Soviet Union and the sordid actions of the U.S. Administration at the Security Council.

It is obvious to everyone, he said, that the U.S. representatives are motivated, not by feelings of humanity or concern for the safety of air traffic, but first and foremost by their anti-Soviet instincts and by the striving to score as many points as possible in psychological warfare against the Soviet Union. The latest address of the U.S. President, which ended with an appeal for fresh appropriations for military purposes and for further escalating the arms race, in particular developing and manufacturing such types of weapons of mass destruction as MX missiles, was characteristic in this respect.

Speaking about the situation in which that flagrant, pre-planned violation of the USSR's airspace took place, the Soviet representative pointed out the fact that deliberate violations of the Soviet state border by U.S. aircraft, counting to get away with them with impunity, have become systematic. This year alone, 12 such violations have taken place. Despite official protests, the activity of U.S. reconnaissance aviation near Soviet air borders has been growing. On August 31, on the eve of the South Korean plane's intrusion into Soviet airspace, seven flights by U.S. RC-135 reconnaissance planes were registered in that region. Simultaneously, there U.S. naval ships appeared close to Soviet territorial waters.

The Soviet representative emphasized that the speech made by the U.S. ambassador was a deliberate attempt to evade giving an answer to key questions. There is, for example, an important question to which an answer is needed, and that is: Why the authorities of the United States and Japan, whose air controller services control traffic on that route, knowing that the intruder plane had been flying in Soviet airspace for a long time, did not take the necessary measures to terminate that gross violation of the Soviet Union's sovereignty?

Why did the U.S. air controller services fail to do anything to warn the plane's crew that they had violated the USSR's state border, in a zone, at that, which is closed to flights by foreign aircraft? Why did they not try to contact the Soviet authorities? Why did they show such a criminal neglect of their duties, such an obvious readiness to risk human lives?

In this connection, the Soviet representative said, one's attention cannot but be drawn to the following fact: The U.S. and Japanese authorities have avoided making public the recordings of the conversations between the South Korean pilot and the controller services on the ground, although the plane, when it was flying over Soviet territory, was in contact with these services for a long time.

Facts demonstrate that the course and character of the flight of the spy plane were not accidental and that the scenario of that tragic incident had been worked out in advance, the Soviet representative declared.

Polish Delegate Supports USSR

LD070426 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0240 GMT 7 Sep 83

[Text] New York, 7 Sep -- TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov reports:

W. Natorf, the Polish permanent representative at the UN, has told a TASS correspondent that the Soviet Government statement provides a clear and exhaustive explanation of the incident involving the South Korean aircraft that violated the state borders of the USSR. The description of the events, which is logical and full of irrefutable facts, contains convincing proof that the United States used a civil aircraft to carry out a major intelligence operation over Soviet territory, deliberately exposing its passengers to deadly peril.

The Soviet Government statement places all the blame for the incident on the Washington leadership, which used it to whip up anti-Soviet hysteria and tension in the pursuit of one objective: To evade a solution of major international problems like halting the arms race and eliminating the threat of a nuclear missile conflict. Judging by President Reagan's actions and declarations, the administration intends to use any pretext to worsen the confrontation with the Soviet Union.

In the UN Security Council the U.S. delegation talks about "moral principles," "humanity," and so on, but is it moral and ethical to amass heaps of lies and charges against the Soviet Union without bothering to investigate the evidence calmly and thoroughly and listen to the other side? The Soviet Government statement has torn the mask off the hypocrites in Washington and shown the entire world the true face of the politicians to whose crimes the passengers of the South Korean aircraft have fallen victim.

W. Natorf stressed that the socialist countries, on behalf of which Poland has been elected a nonpermanent member of the UN Security Council, fully support the Soviet Government statement and consider that all responsibility for the tragedy that has occurred lies wholly and entirely with the leaders of the United States.

COMMENTARY ON REAGAN 'SLANDER' OVER KAL INCIDENT

'Pathological Anti-Communism'

PMO71039 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Sep 83 Second Edition p 3

[TASS Report: "White House Chief's Slandorous Speech"]

[Text] Washington September 6 TASS -- President Reagan has made a radio and television appearance with a slanderous speech which was imbued with pathological anti-communism and containing mendacious concoctions in relation to the Soviet Union in connection with an incident involving a South Korean plane which intruded into Soviet airspace.

He summarized once again the C.I.A.-elaborated U.S. version of the incident with the South Korean plane, issuing forth a torrent of rude abuses and slander in relation to the Soviet Union, in which he attempted, without any grounds and evidence whatsoever, to shift the blame for the incident.

But the head of the White House still had to acknowledge two important facts which make the U.S. version of that provocative incident appear in a totally different light. First, he confirmed for the first time that during its flight the South Korean plane had been "in the vicinity" of a U.S. RC-135 reconnaissance aircraft, which Reagan claimed had been "on a routine mission".

The ABC radio and television network reported that the administration had been also forced to admit that the U.S. RC-135 reconnaissance aircraft had really crossed the route of the South Korean plane and been not far from it when the latter intruded into the USSR's airspace. It follows from a document circulated by the White House that it is precisely after that meeting with the spy plane that the South Korean jetliner "strayed" off course, flagrantly violating the Soviet state border. In its turn, UPI news agency said, quoting informed sources in the Pentagon, that U.S. RC-135 spy planes used civil aviation liners of various countries to "cover up" their intelligence-gathering operations near the USSR's borders all the time.

Second, Reagan attempted, clumsily, to make it appear as if the violation of the Soviet Union's sovereignty had been merely the result of "a mistake" with which the C.I.A. and other U.S. espionage agencies allegedly had had nothing to do. Thus, he declared, with meaning, that no matter how modern the on-board computer was, it still was programmed by people and that its work was "to respond to input provided by human hands". "No one will ever know whether a mistake was made in giving the computer the course or whether there was a malfunction," he grieved affectedly. In other words, what happened was the U.S. President's undisguised attempt at absolving himself from responsibility for the provocation staged against the USSR, while at the same time leaving a "loophole" for himself in case new facts, exposing its true organisers, come to light.

Reagan failed to provide answers to the questions that must be answered by those who sent the spy-plane into the Soviet Union's air space: Why did it veer off its course by 500 kilometers and follow the wrong course for two and a half hours, why, on noticing Soviet fighters, did it not leave the Soviet Union's air space and not land at an advised location, why was it flying without identification lights, why did it try so hard to make its way into secret areas, and lastly, why did the United States, which was monitoring the flight, not interfere in the developments?

But then, the answer to the question who needed this provocation is obvious. Moreover, it follows from Reagan's speech that his administration is going to press ahead with its policy of aggravating international tensions, whipping up the arms race, developing new systems of mass annihilation weapons, and torpedoing arms limitation measures, in other words, a policy aimed at depriving mankind of the right to life. He emphasized that Washington pursues as a policy of "peace through strength" peace through fear.

At the same time he hypocritically begged the almighty that this fear might never become reality. The White House chief came up with such evaluations and used such language with respect to the countries with whom the United States maintains diplomatic relations as to indicate how narrow-minded he is and how little he knows about the Soviet Union and the Soviet people. He claimed the right to threaten the Soviet state with sanctions and made his judgment on whether the United States might or might not violate the Soviet Union's air space. At the same time he maintained that the Soviet Union did not have the right to take measures with respect to the intruder-aircraft. Such a statement can come only from a person unversed in international law. But, if he himself is ignorant in this field, perhaps he has advisers who could have explained (to him) that there exists an international law upholding the inalienable right of a state to protect its sovereignty.

Reagan stated without foundation that the Soviet Union was a country where human rights were violated. This pronouncement came from the President of the country where millions of people have been thrown out into the streets, have neither jobs nor roofs over their heads, where the authorities crush labor unions and throw union activists behind bars. The world remembers all about the bloody "feats" of U.S. "human rights champions" on the soil of long-suffering Vietnam, where they destroyed millions of civilians, razed entire cities and villages to the ground, and carried out wholesale massacres of all those suspected of "sympathies" with the patriotic forces -- including women, old people and children.

And speaking about considerations of humanism, the United States showed in full measure its "humanism", so to say, in Vietnam and in Lebanon. Justifying the bloody crimes of the U.S. military, the U.S. leaders who are hypocritically shedding "crocodile tears" concerning the crash of a passenger plane are deceiving the public. To hear them speak, U.S. forces in Lebanon are not at all participating in hostilities, are not shelling residential quarters of Beirut but are merely "exercising their right to self-defense", in the home of others, thousands of kilometers away from the United States territory. Reagan now says that the United States will work toward ensuring the safety of civil aviation. But the United States should first of all see to it that the U.S. warplanes should fly over their own territory, and not far away from U.S. territory, should not peek in others' lands. If the United States does not do it now, the matters might go so far that sending the spy plane deep into the space over the Soviet Union by "error" today, the United States will launch a missile tomorrow.

Reagan has already shown his troglodyte anti-communism when he launched a "crusade" against socialist countries. Now he tries to continue it. But history has already showed how such crusades end.

'New Brinkmanship'

LD061607 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua article: "Barbarians and Hypocrites"]

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan was following his usual repertoire: He started with a prayer, ended with God's blessing, and between the prayer and the blessing he offered American television viewers a monstrous sandwich of lies and hatred -- lies about the South Korean plane which made a provocative flight over Soviet territory, and hatred for the land of the Soviets, its people, and the high ideals of socialism and communism, democracy, and progress. Reagan concluded his television speech in the evening of 5 September with these words addressed to his listeners: "Thank you...and goodnight." But what the U.S. President was talking about will not earn him the gratitude of the peoples -- and that includes the American people -- because the essence of this malevolent speech threatens mankind not with tranquil days and nights, but with a new intensification of international tension, new brinkmanship -- this time on the brink of nuclear missile war -- and threatens a catastrophe without precedent in our planet's history.

It is common knowledge that barbarity and hypocrisy are two sides of the same coin. The medieval inquisitors, while burning dissidents at the stake, made a fuss about the "gentleness" of their obscurantism on the grounds that the executions took place "without bloodshed." President Reagan's television speech was concocted according to precisely this inquisitorial formula, only the scale of the lie and its possible consequences were not medieval, but quite up to the level of our computer age. By the way, a word about computers. Speaking of the South Korean Boeing and the fact that it was fitted with computerized equipment, the President said: "It is the task of the computer to react to what is fed into it by human hands. Nobody will ever know whether a mistake was made when the data about the plane's route was fed into the computer, or whether it is a question of a technical fault." Nobody will ever know? Are you so sure of that, Mr President?

Enough is already known to answer the question, whose were the so-called "human hands" and what did they feed into the Boeing-747's computers. More and more new information is coming in literally every day to indicate that the CIA's hands, the Pentagon's hands, and, if we embark on political generalizations, the hands of the U.S. military-industrial complex programmed the tragic loss of the South Korean airliner, sacrificing its passengers on the altar of the selfish interests of the U.S. ruling circles, which have nothing in common with the interests of world peace.

Here are just a few of the facts which confirm this: At 2110 Moscow time on 31 August, the Tokyo air traffic control center received a radio message from the Boeing 747: "We have safely crossed the south of Kamchatka." As THE WASHINGTON POST writes, at precisely that time the plane had crossed Kamchatka and was flying over the Sea of Okhotsk. At 2215 the crew requested permission from the Tokyo center to climb to 11,000 meters. At 2220 the pilots received permission to climb from 9,750 meters to the altitude specified. Although THE WASHINGTON POST does not give all the details of the exchanges, it notes that throughout the flight the crew did not report any technical faults or Soviet fighters. On 4 September another American newspaper, THE NEW YORK TIMES, wrote, citing U.S. intelligence organs, that the South Korean plane deliberately encroached on the USSR's airspace. So it is not a question of a computer failure, but of the program fed into the computers by "human hands."

Even people crazed with anti-Sovietism do not dare assert that these hands were the "hands of Moscow." You do not have to be a palmist to discover the origin of these hands, which cannot, however, be called human. After all, what they program is a hatred of mankind.

As in the past, the incident of the South Korean plane took place at a "convenient" time for Washington. To paraphrase Voltaire, one might say: If the incident had not happened, it would have been necessary to invent it. And Washington did invent it -- as far as the Soviet Union is concerned -- and did think it up and plan it, as far as the essence of the matter is concerned. Without going too deeply into the details of the present-day international situation, I will just mention the fact that the provocative violation of the Soviet Union's airspace took place on the eve of the start of a new round in the Geneva talks on Euromissiles, on the eve of the final stage of the Madrid conference, and on the eve of the commencement of work by the U.S. Congress, which has on its agenda the approval of a new, still more impressive budget for the arms race.

Yes, the act of provocation concocted in the Washington corridors of power was, so to speak, a "cluster" provocation. It was one more missile to torpedo the relaxation of international tension, one more nail in the coffin the Pentagon has fashioned for the hopes of peace and the peoples' security nurtured by people of good will. Those who programmed the South Korean aircraft's computers understand very well that in a heated atmosphere, an atmosphere of hysteria, it is easier to heat up the arms race, easier to keep in check their recalcitrant allies in military blocks, and easier to avoid solving the urgent problems of the present day, primarily the problem of war and peace.

In his television speech Reagan spoke of how "our hearts and souls go out" to those who died on board the South Korean airliner. This is another tribute to hypocrisy. History knows many examples of aggressors and conquerors driving unarmed women, old men, and children in front of their hordes. That is how the barbarians of the past behaved, that is how the "highly civilized" representatives of the Aryan race behaved in World War II.

No, the Washington rulers' hearts and souls do not go out to the innocent victims of the programmed act of provocation. Their hearts and souls, their hands which grip the nuclear missile cudgel are reaching out for world rule. And this adventurist end justifies, in their eyes, any adventurist means. It is far from fortuitous that, "extrapolating" from the new act of provocation, some U.S. military specialists predict that the Pentagon will step up pressure demanding the implementation of a first nuclear strike strategy. Observer Dennis Barker writes about this in the newspaper THE GUARDIAN: "The desire to get in first" forms the basis of the plans to deploy the Pershing II missiles in West Europe. Finally the newspaper quotes Major General Neil (Bir), deputy chief of staff of the Space Command, as saying that he "knows no better way to safeguarding peace for the next 50-100 years than establishing control over the earth's space environs." And, let us add on our own behalf, all the more so control over the closer "environs of the earth" like those where the South Korean aircraft's intrusion occurred.

Despite the fact that Reagan's television speech was primarily of a propagandist nature, and was a model of "crusading" rhetoric, it nonetheless contained a plain indication as to where the real boundaries of the U.S. line of state pass. Having "fired" a round of false allegations against the Soviet Union and communism in general, Reagan got down to business, so to speak.

"The real test of our resolve is whether we still have sufficient willpower to stay strong," the President said. A familiar tone producing militarist music! Indeed, Reagan's speech did actually contain the "music" itself! He said, "When Congress resumes its work after the recess it will encounter very important problems in the defense field. I know that there are perfectly legitimate differences of opinion in connection with this problem, but I urge the members of this respected body to think well about this act of aggression by the Russians (that is how the act of provocation against our country is described in Washington's political jargon -- M.S.) when they examine the problem of safeguarding security...."

You are somehow even ashamed to tag onto this statement the seemingly inevitable formula: So that's what's at the bottom of it! After all, everything here is clearly visible, nothing is buried, nothing is hidden. Everything is as clear as it was on the night when, to quote Reagan, "there was a half moon in the sky," when the Boeing 747 was travelling over the expanses of our country.

For greater conviction, President Reagan took as his witness the recently deceased Senator Henry Jackson and quoted his words to the effect that "the greatest danger now threatening the United States is the danger presented by the Soviet Union." Then Reagan recalled that Senator Jackson had come out in the Senate in support of the program for building and deploying the MX ICBM's -- also a first-strike weapon. Yes, here too everything is perfectly clear.

There is a certain sinister irony in the fact that the South Korean aircraft which provocatively violated Soviet airspace was a product of the U.S. Boeing aircraft company and that the late Senator Henry Jackson has gone down in history not as the senator from Washington state, but as the senator from Boeing whose interests he represented on Capitol Hill, as he did the interests of other death concerns. As for Jackson's "phrophetic" words, quoted by Reagan, I will quote the words of another senator -- Fulbright: "We have created a society whose chief occupation is violence. The most serious threat to our society is posed not by some foreign force, but by militarism at home. The depressing impression is that we in America have clearly grown accustomed to war. For many years now we have either been fighting or have been ready at a moment's notice to start a war in any part of the world. War and the military have become an integral part of our daily life and violence has become the most important product in our country."

And the provocation, whose instrument and victim was a South Korean civil aircraft, was a "product" of this.

If the Boeing's computers were programmed for military intelligence tasks, Reagan's latest television appearance was programmed for psychological warfare. The U.S. President, invading the sphere of "moral foundations," the "spirit of humanity," and the "rights of the individual and values of human life," merely gave another version of his notorious speech to the British Parliament where he declared a crusade against the Soviet Union, slanderously calling it the "focus of evil." Hatred has always been a bad counsel, and, if one is talking in modern terms, a bad and unreliable computer.

Mr President again showed that he knows neither the history of the Soviet Union nor its true aims and that his blind anticommunism is a dangerous obsession which distorts reality. As for the charges against us, with which Reagan's rhetoric is thickly larded, they are, so to speak, "autobiographical."

They are inspired by quite a different model, by the very gentlemen Senator Fulbright was talking about. During its more than 200 years of existence the United States has participated in 200 wars. But let's not get too involved in history. Let us just recall the aggression in Vietnam which took millions of lives. Let us remember the tragedy of Lebanon and the victims of Sabra and Shatila. Let us remember the countries of Central America groaning beneath the Pentagon jackboot. Finally, let us remember that the world's first nuclear killers were those very people who are now trying to teach us morality and humanity. Or maybe it was Soviet and not U.S. aircraft which dropped the atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing hundreds of thousands of inhabitants of those Japanese cities?

What happened on a "bright night lit by a half moon" is just a link in the chain of U.S. imperialism's crimes. The barbarians of the 20th century, bent on turning it into the "age of Americanism," will answer for it sooner or later. Not to their conscience -- they have none -- but to the peoples.

'Important Questions' Remain

LD062009 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 6 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Hello comrades. The unbridled anti-Soviet campaign is continuing in the United States over the incident involving the South Korean aircraft which violated the airspace of the Soviet Union. The tone is set by President Reagan. He has made another anti-Soviet statement. Once again Reagan has expounded the U.S. version of the incident, a version worked out by the CIA, resorting to slanderous fabrications against the Soviet Union.

In so doing he was nonetheless forced to admit several important facts. He confirmed that during its flight, the South Korean aircraft was in the vicinity of one of the U.S. RC-135 spy planes which, as Reagan asserted, was carrying out a normal task.

The U.S. reconnaissance aircraft even intersected the route being followed by the South Korean liner and was not far away from it when it entered the airspace of the USSR.

President Reagan tried to represent things as if this incursion took place as a result of some sort of mistake. He said that the on-board computer, however perfect it may be, is programmed by people and that allegedly no one will ever know whether a mistake was made when data on the route of the plane was programmed into the computer or whether a technical fault occurred.

In other words, the White House chief tried to take responsibility for the provocation against the Soviet Union away from his services.

At the same time, Reagan made furious attacks on our country. His statement has shown once again that the United States wants to use the incident to exacerbate tension in the world and to justify his own aggressive policy, in the direction of escalating the arms race. In his speech, Reagan said that peace must be achieved with the help of force. Evidently, he counts on dictating his conditions to our country from a position of strength.

The President granted himself the right to threaten us with sanctions and to justify violation of the borders of the Soviet Union and in doing this he hypocritically talks about love for mankind and about the human casualties involved. Talk about that to whomsoever you please, but not to the U.S. President, who is to blame for the deaths of tens of thousands of peaceful inhabitants in Vietnam, Central America and the Near East.

At the same time as Mr Reagan expatiates on love for mankind the U.S. Marines are firing on Lebanese villages and bandits hired and paid by Washington are making short work of peaceful inhabitants in Nicaragua and Afghanistan. The U.S. President said that the Soviet Union had allegedly no legal or moral right, no justification to take steps concerning the plane which violated Soviet air space. But only someone ill-versed in matters of international law can make a statement like that or else someone who is trying to mislead the public. There are laws defining the sovereign rights of states to protect their frontiers. What would the U.S. President say if, for example, tomorrow let's say a Soviet aircraft appeared over the secret parts of the United States?

President Reagan also said that the United States takes upon itself concern for peaceful civilian flights, that is to say on the world scale. But he should concern himself with ensuring that U.S. military aircraft do not fly all over the world, tens of thousands of kilometers from their own territory.

As far as the story of the South Korean aircraft is concerned, as new details about it come to light it becomes increasingly clear that the passengers on this aircraft were sacrificed in advance by those who organized this further operation against the Soviet Union. There are many important questions to which President Reagan did not give any persuasive answer. How could an aircraft equipped with the most modern navigation equipment with so many backup systems stray so far and for so long from its correct course? Why did the United States and Japanese services which were tracking the aircraft's flight, and which, as has emerged, were even recording conversations concerning its incursion, not warn either the crew of the South Korean liner or the Soviet services about it? Why did the crew behave so strangely? It reacted to none of the attempts by the Soviet pilot to draw attention to the fact that it had violated airspace. Why was the intruder plane flying without its lights on and literally stole over Soviet territory?

And finally, why was there a U.S. reconnaissance plane in the area of intrusion and why did Washington admit this only 5 days after the incident took place?

It is not so very difficult to answer all these questions which seem to puzzle Western observers and which the U.S. Administration is studiously avoiding. Either the crew of the South Korean plane was on a special reconnaissance mission and the Boeing had installed on board the appropriate apparatus or it was taking part in a deliberate provocation, and perhaps both.

In any case, one thing is clear: the aircraft's deviation from its course was programmed back on earth and because of that the U.S. intelligence service did not hesitate to risk passengers' lives.

Incidentally, this is confirmed by another telegram which we have received from Washington. According to a report from the American UPI agency, a U.S. Defense Department representative has admitted that U.S. RC-135 spy planes do use civil airliners from various companies to conceal their reconnaissance flights near Soviet territory. Commenting on this report the UPI agency notes that spy planes literally hang [zavisayut] over passenger liners to mislead radar stations of the USSR anti-aircraft defense. It was just that sort of reconnaissance plane that was in the air alongside the South Korean aircraft which had encroached on our airspace.

'Blasphemy,' 'Web of Lies'

PM071340 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Sep 1983 Second Edition p 3

["Rejoinder" by TASS Political Observer Yu. Kornilov under the heading "Blasphemy."]

[Text] Slander and hatred are poor guides and those who use them can only get entangled in their own web of lies. This is confirmed once again by the television show staged by President Reagan of the United States, who whipped up anti-Soviet passions, tried to sow seeds of enmity and hatred for the Soviet people and alleged that the Soviet authorities supposedly were barring relatives of those who died in the "Boeing" from going to the area of the crash to perform a religious ceremony. Posing before television cameras, Reagan talked at length about the "bereaved Japanese families" which supposedly cannot even come close to the place where the plane is thought to have crashed.

We have here a report from Tokyo which says the following: Representatives of the Japanese Government told the Soviet Embassy in Japan that the visit of a group of relatives of those who were killed in the crash of the South Korean plane to the area of the crash passed successfully and that the Japanese Government expresses gratitude to the Soviet authorities. Representatives of the Japanese authorities also reported that on September 6 and 7 two more groups of the Japanese and South Koreans will be sent from Wakkanai port on board the "Soya-Maru-5" vessel into the area of the crash to perform a religious rite.

What can be said about this? That lie upon lie literally permeates all the talk of the U.S. President who tries for the sake of self-seeking political aims to distort things. Not stopping at this, President Reagan, blinded by the striving to slander the Soviet Union at any cost, has now started speculating on human grief, on the memory of the deceased. Blasphemy, this is the only way to describe it.

U.S. Media Reports Cited

PM070753 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Palladin dispatch: "Covering Up the Traces of a Crime"]

[Text] Washington -- Until now the inhabitants of the West knew of the combination of figures 007 as the pseudonym of James Bond, the hero of numerous detective movies and novels. Now these three figures are once again appearing on television screens and in newspaper pages here, but not at all because a new series of the superspy's adventures has been released. But because 007 is the number of the flight made by an aircraft of the South Korean airline which grossly violated the USSR state border on the night of 31 August-1 September.

Almost a week has elapsed since the airliner, which was flying from New York to Seoul, disappeared. During this time newspapers running to dozens of pages and U.S. television, which broadcasts almost round the clock, have carried a great deal of varied "information" presented by the White House concerning the aircraft. At the same time the American press is rehashing in every possible way the "explanations," proceeding from the same source, of the actions of the Soviet fighters sent to intercept the aerial interloper. Washington's all-seeing ability could only be envied if the version it proposes contained even a grain of truth.

However, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, this type of aircraft is controlled by electronic apparatus which has never yet let down the pilots and cannot let them down, since it has a triple safety margin. Consequently, either the person seated at the controls or those who deliberately fed distorted parameters of the usual route into the onboard computers could have taken the Boeing 747 airliner 500 km deep into the USSR's airspace. This conclusion follows, in point of fact, from an interview granted to THE NEW YORK TIMES by the manufacturers of the aircraft's control system.

A rejoinder by a Pentagon spokesman cited by ABC is also characteristic. Commenting on the fact that the South Korean aircraft was over Soviet territory for more than 2 hours, the American television company's interlocutor voiced cynical surprise that no attempt was made to "stop" the border violator earlier.

Many more remarkable facts and details are surfacing in the pages of the local press. Thus, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, the American authorities have themselves admitted that not one but two reconnaissance aircraft of the American Air Force (also, incidentally, Boeings which, moreover, are outwardly similar to the airliner on Flight 007) are constantly flying along the USSR's Far Eastern border, and they cynically, almost smugly divulge information on the huge scale of the espionage activity being conducted by the United States on our motherland's eastern outskirts. All these facts cannot but confirm the thought already being expressed here (so far, it is true, in a whisper and cautiously) that those who bought tickets for Flight 007, suspecting nothing, fell victim to a monstrous provocation of unprecedented perfidy.

Now about who profits from such a provocation. And the answer to this question certainly does not have any twofold interpretation. It was essentially provided by the U.S. President himself in his 5 September speech on national television. The head of the White House plainly demanded in Congress, to the accompaniment of the affair of the South Korean aircraft, that doubts be cast aside and the programs drawn up earlier by his administration for the further intensification of the arms race be approved. At the same time Reagan urged the U.S. allies to resume the attempts to create a united front on an anti-Soviet basis. As a CBS commentator accurately said in this regard, the White House's previous attempts to declare economic and diplomatic war on the USSR in isolation failed, and now Reagan intends to try to achieve the same aims with his allies' help.

But in the affair of the South Korean aircraft on Flight 007 the U.S. President has taken on the role of protector of those who sent the passenger airliner deep into USSR territory and doomed its passengers to death.

World Press Reviewed

PM071335 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Sep 1983 Second Edition p 3

[TASS Report: "In the Heat of Anticommunism"]

[Text] The unbridled anti-Soviet hysteria being whipped up by Washington, for which the previously planned provocation involving violation of the USSR's airspace served as a pretext, pursues unscrupulous political ends: to cast a shadow on the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union, to whip up international tension yet further, to torpedo the arms limitation talks and to create conditions in which the United States could conduct a policy "from a position of strength." This idea runs firmly through foreign press material and statements by politicians and public figures commenting on the "incident" of the South Korean aircraft which violated Soviet borders.

Having unleashed an anti-Soviet campaign over the South Korean aircraft incident, President Reagan in his television speech called for the U.S. Congress to approve all the administration's demands in respect of the program to set up, test and deploy a qualitatively new system of strategic nuclear weapons -- the MX missile. G. Hart, the influential American senator who is seeking the Democratic Party nomination for the post of president, said: The attempt to establish a link between the incident and the plans for missile deployment is dangerous. Realization of such plans would only further destabilize relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and reinforce the danger of a flare-up of nuclear conflict.

Observers note that Washington is trying to use the provocation with the aircraft to whip up international tension and to justify its negative position at the arms limitation talks. This is directly and indirectly confirmed by representatives of the U.S. Administration themselves. U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs R. Burt, for example, speaking in a CBS broadcast, gave an affirmative answer to the question as to whether this incident could help the United States to achieve the deployment of its new nuclear missiles in Europe, despite objections from opponents of this in European countries.

"Who is responsible for the naked anti-Soviet campaign now unleashed in the West?" asks chief editor G. Polikeit in the pages of the West German UNSERE ZEIT. And he answers: "Only the fanatics of the arms race in Washington and the right wing government in Bonn are responsible for it. They need this political climate in which it would be possible to implement the deployment of the new U.S. nuclear missiles threatening the lives of people and to step up the implementation of the multi-billion program for arms increases. Those who proclaimed the "crusade" against communism proclaimed the Soviet Union as some kind of "concentration of evil." In the Soviet Union, as distinct from the United States, there is no one who would be interested in exacerbating the international climate. The peace initiatives of the Soviets show in all clarity that the USSR is striving for peace and for reaching mutually acceptable agreements at the talks to curb the arms race.

The British FINANCIAL TIMES points out that the fate of the South Korean plane was the result of its deviation by several hundred miles from the set course and its flight over Soviet military facilities on Sakhalin. Any state, the paper stresses, exercises sovereignty over the airspace over its territory and has the right to take any measures, including extreme ones, with regard to a plane intruding into the limits of this space.

The Japanese AKAHATA writes that among those who are well-informed on military questions there are many people who suppose that the flight of the South Korean plane which intruded into the USSR's airspace was being made for espionage purposes. The paper cites a statement by Kurisu, former chairman of the Joint Staff Council of Japan, who stressed that "pilots of the South Korean airline are former military pilots, and it is quite possible that the pilot of the Boeing, too, having received an instruction from the United States, penetrated Sakhalin for reconnaissance purposes."

It is noted that the American authorities in fact inciting malicious demonstrations by reactionary elements with regard to the representations of Soviet organizations and establishments in the United States, in particular with regard to the USSR's Consulate General in San Francisco. At the same time it is noted here that the overwhelming majority of the population did not allow themselves to be led by the organizers of the latest unbridled anti-Soviet campaign. Their reckoning on holding a "demonstration by many people" in front of the building housing the Soviet Consulate General in San Francisco, which was persistently called for by the local television, failed.

A number of American press organs point out that the attempt by the Washington administration to make use of the incident with the airplane to distract the American public from acute internal problems of the country is not attaining its aim. At numerous gatherings now taking place for Labor Day, there is sharp criticism of the antipopular internal policy of the Reagan administration and its adventurist course in the international arena.

"The shameless provocation with the South Korean airplane which grossly violated USSR airspace had been preplanned by the CIA in order to cast a shadow on the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union," the paper NEVES DEUTSCHLAND (GDR) emphasizes. "The hysterical campaign surrounding the South Korean airplane which has disappeared and the cynical game being played regarding human lives is being used for dark political purposes."

KAL INCIDENT 'PLANNED, PROVOCATIVE VIOLATION'

PM061643 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Sep 83 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA Political Observer Vitaliy Korionov: "A Policy of Subversion Against Peace"]

[Text] The malicious anti-Soviet campaign unleashed by the White House in connection with the aircraft that violated Soviet borders has assumed an unprecedented scale. Hysterical statements by the President are following one after another, with each one surpassing the last in terms of brazenness. But facts are stubborn things and cannot be refuted even by the indecent rhetoric to which the President is resorting. A most flagrant violation of a sovereign state's borders has occurred: A violation that was manifestly planned and provocative in nature. Who planned this provocation and why? The world public awaits an answer to this question, but the President is not even contemplating giving thought to it.

Standing on the conductor's rostrum of this hysteria is the White House, whose boss has surpassed himself in his pathological hatred for the Soviet Union and our people.

When in the fifties the present U.S. President was hosting the weekly "General Electric Theater" television program he proclaimed himself a "fighter in the ideological war," promising: "I will not cease the ideological 'drama.'" And the President is in there fighting. He is tolerating devices that are impermissible in a civilized world.

The well-known American political observer J. Reston writes: When Reagan was working on the General Electric radio show, advertizing washing machines, his occupation was of no significance for the country, but it is a completely different matter when, having become President, he "makes so many scandalous provocative statements." And the American weekly TIME adds: "Mentally and emotionally Reagan is living in the past. The past is his future. But is this true for the country?"

Indeed this is dangerous not only for the United States. When political intriguers who are not only ignorant but also think and act adventuristically are to be found at the helm of the biggest imperialist power, which sets the tone in the aggressive NATO military bloc, this creates an exceptionally dangerous situation in the world.

Of course, in the past too, certain American politicians have not bothered about morality and ethics. A document that stated: "We must develop effective espionage and counterespionage services. We must learn how to conduct subversive activity and sabotage and destroy our enemies with more sophisticated and fruitful methods..." emerged from the depths of Capitol Hill during Eisenhower's presidency. However, maybe never before has this amoral policy been honed to such "perfection" as in the past 2 years.

The American magazine MOTHER JONES writes: "Disaster lobbyists has gotten into power" under the Reagan administration. The adventurist foreign policy course of such figures contradicts the vital interests of the peoples and is rejected by the overwhelming majority of mankind. "Reagan," the Paris-published American newspaper THE INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE notes, "has become one of the most isolated presidents since World War II."

The U.S. ruling elite needs a world atmosphere making it possible to justify the unrestrained arms race it has unleashed and to implement such intentions as the plan to transform Europe into the Pentagon's nuclear missile testing ground, the military actions in Central America and Lebanon, and the creation of more and more new "trouble spots" in the world -- schemes that are so dangerous for the cause of peace and the fate of mankind.

It is in this kind of atmosphere that provocations like the aircraft "incident" are carried out. The handwriting of those American special services that have become highly skilled in organizing dirty deeds of this kind is clearly perceptible here.

"This incident," former NSA Director and former CIA Deputy Director Admiral Inman admits, "will make it possible to facilitate unanimity between the United States and West Europe on the need to adopt tough measures in the security sphere." The professional CIA intelligence officer knows what he is writing about.

The American newspaper THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER notes: "In the north of the Japanese island of Hokkaido alone 1,000 American servicemen are employed in staffing an enormous electronic radio interception center. The brand new Cobra system, which can be installed in ships and aircraft and on the ground, has been deployed in the Far East; it can be used to intercept radio conversations at a distance of hundreds of miles." For its part ABC TV reports: "The NSA was able to monitor the South Korean aircraft's flight from its headquarters near Washington."

And this entire, vast military machine didn't know that the aircraft was deep inside Soviet territory? Who is going to believe that? Isn't it more logical to say that everything in this scenario was premeditated and calculated?

History will eventually establish precisely what role the CIA and the other U.S. espionage centers played in this tragedy. The CIA's handwriting is well known. Suffice it to recall the crash of the passenger aircraft belonging to the Cuban airline Cuban de Aviacion, which exploded on 6 October 1976 a few minutes after takeoff from an airport on the island of Barbados. When a search team raised fragments of the fuselage from the seabed, residues of the explosive substance ("Si-4"), found only in the arsenals of the U.S. Army and intelligence services, were discovered. Have the CIA's work methods really changed since that time?

Unleashing provocations and acts of sabotage constitutes an organic component of the policy of the most insistent U.S. imperialist circles. The desire to dominate the world and to enslave other peoples is what motivates their policy, "Our sphere of responsibility," the master of the White House lays down, "embraces the entire world." But the meaning invested in the concept of responsibility is such that it becomes a most irresponsible game with people's futures, with the future of peoples and countries. In the "incident" of the aircraft that violated the Soviet borders, this game cost the lives of many totally innocent people.

FORMER KAL PASSENGERS CITED ON LIGHTING PRACTICES

LD070855 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 7 Sep 83

[Text] Ottawa September 7 TASS -- Passenger planes of the South Korean Airline "KAL" fly with their lights out close to the borders of the Soviet Union. This follows from accounts by many passengers who repeatedly flew the airline planes from New York to Seoul. The Canadian newspaper CITIZEN quotes today accounts by three passengers who flew to South Korea in December 1980.

Three passengers -- two students and a journalist from different Canadian cities -- told the newspaper that during the flight near the Soviet borders all portholes were closed, and the passengers were strongly recommended to sleep and were not allowed to use even individual lighting for reading. The passengers note also that when they lifted the porthole covers, they found to their great surprise that the navigation lights were also put out.

Kim Schroeder, a student of Glendon College, told CITIZEN's correspondent that when flying close to the Soviet borders air-hostesses ordered all passengers to switch off individual lighting after general lighting inside the plane was switched off as well. They insisted on this until all lights were out.

Michael Ungar, a student of McGill University, confirmed that when he looked out the porthole he saw that all navigation lights were off. The plane was flying in the dark, he said.

Journalist Terry O'Gorman of Pembroke also confirmed the fact that South Korean planes fly close to Soviet territory with their navigation lights turned off.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) interviewed a Canadian citizen who repeatedly travelled by the South Korean Airline from New York to Seoul. When all lights inside the plane were switched off and portholes closed, he tried to look out the window and noticed that all external lights were switched off and the identification marking of the plane was practically invisible. When an air-hostess saw him looking out the window, she demanded that he close the cover, the passenger said.

These reports confirm the Soviet Government's statement which says, in particular, that the Soviet pilots, curbing the actions of the intruder plane, could not know that this was a civilian plane. It flew without navigation lights, late at night in conditions of bad visibility, and did not respond to signals. It also mentioned here that no list of passengers of the South Korean airliner has as yet been published in the United States which might indicate that agents of American special services were among the passengers. Such lists usually indicate the occupation of passengers, and their publication is an established practice in the United States.

JAPANESE, SOVIET TRADE UNIONISTS MEET IN ODESSA

Shalayev Meets Delegates

OW042000 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 31 Aug 83

[Text] The 14th meeting of the Soviet and Japanese trade unions on peace and friendship between the Soviet Union and Japan will open 1 September in Odessa, a Soviet coastal city.

On 30 August, a meeting was held between Shalayev, chairman of the Presidium of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and the officials of the Japanese delegation to attend the meeting, including Shiro Taira, deputy secretary general of the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan, Toranori Kumamoto, director of the council's Bureau of Popular Movement, and (Manabu Tabuchi), vice president of the Federation of Independent Unions of Japan. At the meeting, conducted in a warm and friendly atmosphere, the participants exchanged views concerning the issue of further promoting exchange activities between the trade unions of the two countries.

Opening Ceremony

OW042008 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 2 Sep 83

[Excerpt] Here is a dispatch by a Moscow radio correspondent from Odessa, Yokohama's sister city on the Black Sea:

The 14th USSR-Japan trade union meeting on USSR-Japan friendship and peace opened at the Cultural Palace of Odessa Polytechnical College on 1 September. The opening ceremony was addressed by Subbotin, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] and head of the Soviet delegation. Nikolay Kirichenko, first secretary of the Odessa Oblast party committee, delivered a speech welcoming the audience and describing the successes scored by the workers of Odessa city and Odessa Oblast in the struggle for socialist construction, close international relations, and peace.

Representing the Japanese delegation, Shiro Taira, deputy secretary general of the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan [SOHYO] and head of the Japanese delegation, addressed the ceremony.

The ceremony was followed by a full-dress meeting, which was addressed by AUCCTU Secretary Subbotin and Toranori Kumamoto, director of the SOHYO national movement bureau and deputy leader of the Japanese delegation. The two speakers stressed the special significance of the new Soviet proposal contained in Soviet leader Andropov's replies to questions raised by the newspaper PRAVDA. They also highly evaluated the role of the USSR-Japan trade union week and stressed the need to strengthen and develop friendly ties between the peoples and trade unions of the Soviet Union and Japan in the interest of peace and social progress.

Those attending the USSR-Japan trade union meeting later participated in a mass rally held in the evening by Odessa workers in observance of Trade Union Action Day for Peace. This antiwar mass rally was addressed by (Viktor Chervayev), a Soviet socialist labor hero, and Noriko Yamamoto, a member of the executive committee of the Hiroshima chapter of the All-Japan Monopoly Corporation Workers Union. Their speeches were warmly applauded.

Meeting Closes

LD040023 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 3 Sep 83

[Text] A Soviet-Japanese trade union meeting for peace and friendship between the peoples of the USSR and Japan ended in Odessa today. Within the framework of the traditional dialogue, envoys of the two countries' trade unions exchanged views on a key issue of the present day -- the struggle to preserve peace -- and mapped out ways for further cooperation between the two countries' mass organizations. (Taira), leader of the Japanese delegation and deputy secretary general of the SOHYO trade union center, said that the Soviet Union's new initiatives, as set forth in Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to PRAVDA, knocks the ground from under the feet of those whose purposes are served by the myth of a Soviet military threat.

Disarmament is the realistic way to peace and the way to ensure that the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are never repeated on earth.

SHULTZ URGES JAPAN TO INCREASE MILITARY BUILDUP

LD032031 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 3 Sep 83

[Text] Washington September 3 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Yegorov reports:

The U.S. is pressing Japan for a further stepping up of its military preparations.

Speaking at the "Shimoda Conference" attended by representatives of Japanese and U.S. business circles, which is under way in Warrenton (Virginia), the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz stated point blank that the U.S. and Japan should speed up preparations for the fulfilment of tasks in the sphere of ensuring "mutual security". This envisages, in the first place, further buildup of Japanese armed forces, as well as Tokyo's joining in the carrying out of gendarme functions in the Far East. The U.S. secretary of state pointed out with satisfaction that the Japanese Government had announced its intention to "protect" sea routes within the range of 1,000 sea miles off Japanese shores.

According to Shultz, this will enable the U.S. to concentrate its attention on military preparations in the south-western part of the Pacific and in the Indian Ocean.

Shultz did not conceal his satisfaction over the fact that Japan is following in the wake of the Reagan administration in such questions as rendering assistance to counter-revolutionary gangs waging an undeclared war against Afghanistan and Kampuchea. He said that this stand of the Japanese Government was evidence of the growing "global responsibility" of Japan. Observers point out that Tokyo's participation in these actions did not meet the interests of Japan itself and only brought about the aggravation of the situation in Asia.

Favouring a broader participation of Tokyo in Washington's military ventures, the U.S. is striving at the same time to shift on its ally the burden of economic problems. Thus, the secretary of state demanded that the Japanese Government should ensure greater access for American goods to the Japanese market. Observers underline that this measure would aggravate economic difficulties experienced by Japan today.

INDIAN FOREIGN MINISTER ARRIVES FOR TALKS

Gromyko Welcomes Rao

LD041052 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 4 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 4 TASS - The Minister of External Relations of India P.V. Narasimha Rao arrived in Moscow today on a brief business visit in accordance with a mutual arrangement.

At the airport the guest was welcomed by Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, foreign minister of the USSR, and other officials.

Gromyko Holds Talks 5 Sep

LD051453 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 5 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS -- Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Andrey Gromyko received Minister for External Affairs of India P.V. Narasimha Rao who has arrived in Moscow on a brief business visit.

Andrey Gromyko and P.V. Narasimha Rao held talks during which, in the traditional atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, they discussed topical international problems, including those linked with the upcoming 38th session of the U.N. General Assembly, as well as some of the issues of the bilateral Soviet-Indian relations.

The sides noted that in the present very complex international situation a further activation of the struggle for peace and international security, for banishing the threat of nuclear war is assuming priority importance.

In this connection, Andrey Gromyko dwelt in detail on the recent new Soviet initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race. These initiatives are a concrete manifestation of the Soviet Union's good will, its determination to do everything depending on it for resolving the burning and urgent problem of concern to all peoples -- that of preventing the new, extremely dangerous spiral in the arms race.

During the discussion of other international problems, special emphasis was placed on the inadmissibility of outside interference in the internal affairs of states, of the threat or use of force. The imperative necessity was stressed to eliminate the existing sources of tensions and conflicts by peaceful means, on a basis acceptable to all the parties involved, be that in the Middle East, South East Asia, Africa or other parts of the world.

The Soviet side expressed its solidarity with the anti-imperialist, anti-militarist directedness of the Movement of Nonalignment. It was pointed out that the results of the seventh conference of the Movement of Nonalignment in New Delhi broaden the scope for the cooperation of all the peace forces in the matter of strengthening peace and security of the peoples in the present-day conditions. The appeal that came from New Delhi -- to resolutely banish the nuclear war threat suspended over mankind, to stop the arms race, and to safeguard a peaceful future for the peoples is consonant with the aspirations and peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The ministers re-affirmed once again the identity or similarity of the positions of the USSR and India on the principal international issues, which serves as the guarantee for a further strengthening of the Soviet-Indian political cooperation for the purposes of maintaining universal peace and security.

In this connection, the important significance was stressed of the Treaty on Peace, Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and India, which has become firmly established among the fundamental documents of the present-day international relations effectively working for peace.

The sides noted with satisfaction the successful development, along an upward line, of the Soviet-Indian cooperation in the economic, trade, scientific and technological and other fields. This cooperation relies on a planned stable basis and is designed as a long-term prospect for the benefit of the peoples of the two countries.

Andrey Gromyko gave a luncheon in honour of P.V. Narasimha Rao, at which the ministers exchanged friendly toasts.

On the same day P.V. Narasimha Rao left the Soviet Union. The guest was seen off at the airport by Andrey Gromyko and other officials. Among the sending-off party was India's Ambassador to the USSR V.K. Ahuja.

[Delhi Domestic Service in English at 0830 GMT on 5 September reports on Rao's Talks with Gromyko and adds: "The additional secretary in the External Affairs Ministry, Dr J.S. Teja, and the Indian ambassador, Mr Vishnu Ahuja, are assisting Mr Narasimha Rao. Mr Andrey Gromyko is being assisted by the first deputy minister, Mr Maltsev and other officials.

After his talks with Mr Gromyko, Mr Rao will leave for Baghdad this evening."]

INDIAN BUSINESSMAN CITED ON TRADE COOPERATION

LD022242 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 2 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 2 TASS - There exist broad opportunities for the increase of purchases of Soviet machinery and equipment by Indian firms, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the industrial group "Raunaq Enterprises" Raunaq Singh told a TASS correspondent today. He headed a delegation of Indian businessmen that held negotiations with representatives of Soviet foreign trade organizations "Avtoexport", "Techmashexport", "Mashinoexport", "Traktoroexport", "Stankoimport", "Mashpriborintorg", "Energomashexport", "Sudoimport" and "Licensintorg".

Managers and directors of privately-owned Indian firms were on the delegation that was on a five-day visit in Moscow at the invitation of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

We are now faced with the task of implementing as soon as possible the arrangements achieved in Moscow since India as a developing country needs varied equipment for the development of its economy, Raunaq Singh said.

U.S., PAKISTAN TO EXPAND MILITARY TIES

LD021223 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 2 Sep 83

[Text] The United States and Pakistan have reached an accord on the further extension of military ties. During the visit of two highly-placed Pentagon representatives to Islamabad, an agreement was signed on the use of Pakistan's naval and air force bases as strong points for American interventionist Rapid Deployment Forces.

FURTHER TASS COVERAGE ON PAKISTAN SITUATION

LD061107 Moscow TASS in English 0910 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] New Delhi September 6 TASS -- Major demonstrations and rallies have taken place in Karachi, Hyderabad, Moro and other cities in the Pakistani Province of Sind and expressed support for the movement for establishing democracy, which unites eight of the country's leading opposition parties, according to reports from Pakistan. Rallies under anti-government and anti-American slogans were also held in Islamabad and Peshawar. A total of 271 deputies of the Legislative Council of Sind handed in their resignations in protest against the authorities' repressions against opposition forces.

The military regime uses undisguised terror to crush the mounting popular protest movement, with troops firing at peaceful demonstrations and conducting wholesale round-ups and arrests. Even according to far from complete data, a total of 50 persons have been killed, hundreds wounded and several thousand thrown behind bars in Sind Province alone since the start of the civil disobedience campaign.

The military tribunal in Karachi sentenced ten opposition figures to imprisonment and fines. Another 100 participants in anti-government actions were sentenced to similar punishment in other parts of the country. Fearing a further upsurge of the student movement, the authorities closed down indefinitely all higher educational establishments.

Dissatisfaction with the regime's policy is also noticed in the army. Officers and men on station at an Air Force base in Rasalpur staged a demonstration of protest against repressions against the population. Servicemen billeted at major Air Force bases in Sargodha and Pesahwar also expressed their opposition to the regime's policy.

London September 6 TASS -- Police arrested a group of Pakistani opposition who had returned from emigration, REUTER reports. They included Ch.M. Arshad, former public health minister, and several members of the parliament dissolved by the military authorities. The arrested face severe punishment by the military tribunal.

Speaking at a press conference in Istanbul where he was on a visit, General Ziaul Haq, head of the Pakistani military regime, declared that his administration is not going to meet the Pakistani people's demands for democracy.

HUNGARY'S JUHAR IN USSR FOR TRADE, TOURISM TALKS

Agreement Signed

LD022058 Budapest MTI in English 1706 GMT 2 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow, September 2 (MTI) -- Zoltan Juhar, Hungarian minister of domestic trade and president of the National Tourism Council, signed an agreement in Moscow on the expansion of tourism and held talks on domestic trade cooperation on the invitation of Petr Abrasimov, president of the State Commission for Tourism under the Soviet Council of Ministers.

During talks on the situation and development of tourist traffic, it was stated that this year there will be trips by 400,000 Soviet and more than 200,000 Hungarian tourists, with 90,000 joining organized tours.

An annual 10 percent increase in tourist traffic is envisaged by the agreement.

An agreement on next year's cooperation between Ibusz and Intourist was also signed.

Zoltan Juhar held talks with his Soviet counterpart Grigory Vashchenko on the expansion of domestic trade exchange and technical-scientific cooperation in the Ukraine the Hungarian minister discussed domestic trade and tourist issues and visited organizations.

After talks with Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy prime minister of the Soviet Union, Zoltan Juhar today returned from Moscow.

Holds Talks; Returns Home

LD030406 Budapest MTI in English 1753 GMT 2 Sep 83

[Text] Budapest, September 2 (MTI) -- Juhar Zoltan, Hungarian minister of internal trade and chairman of the National Council for Tourism, has returned from a visit to the Soviet Union paid on the invitation of Petr Abrasimov, president of the State Council for Tourism under the Soviet Council of Ministers, from August 29 to September [no September date as received].

The sides discussed the development of reciprocal tourism. 400,000 Soviet citizens are expected to visit Hungary and 200,000 Hungarians will travel to the Soviet Union this year.

Further tasks include the development of tourism by an annual 10 percent, and its promotion by cut prices.

Zoltan Juhar held talks with Grigoriy Vashchenko, Soviet minister of domestic trade, on the increase in the assortment of domestic goods and the development of technical-scientific cooperation.

Ivan Arkhipov, first vice-chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers, also met Zoltan Juhar.

W. EUROPE REACTION TO KOREAN PLANE INCIDENT

UK Media Echo U.S.

LD052043 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 5 Sep 83

[Text] The mass media in Britain appear to have joined those in the United States in whipping up yet another anti-Soviet campaign, and this time over the fate of the aircraft that disappeared during the night of August 31. In Vantage Point, Boris Belitskiy points out how biased is the Western presentation of the facts of the case.

In their accounts of what happened and their comments on the case, the British media have relied almost exclusively on the American version of the event, a version produced by its own admission with the active participation of the Central Intelligence Agency. Little or no mention has been made of the important questions raised in the statement put out on Friday by the official Soviet news agency TASS. Why was the plane that intruded into Soviet airspace so far off course? Why did it persist in flying over Soviet territory and territorial waters for over 2 hours? Why, in violation of international regulations, was it flying without navigation lights? Why did it absolutely refuse to respond to the signals of Soviet air traffic controllers? Why did it ignore the attempts of the Soviet air defense planes to establish contact with it? Why were American services tracking its flight so carefully -- but not informing it that it was 500 kms off course and inside Soviet airspace? And so on and so forth. None of these questions have received a satisfactory answer.

The British media echoed the American version that the plane strayed off course. But Richard Weston of THE NEW YORK TIMES has revealed that the plane was equipped not only with three computerized navigation systems, but with radar that enables pilots to follow coastline and other terrain features. It's hard to believe a plane with such sophisticated navigational aids flew for 2,000 kms without the pilots' realizing they were so far off course. Similarly, all claims that the plane was in trouble technically are disproved by Japanese news agency reports that Japanese air traffic control was in contact with it until it disappeared. The Boeing also confirmed to the Japanese air traffic controllers that its navigational equipment was in perfect order.

To me, the whole affair has brought back memories of the American U-2 spy plane episode in 1960, in which I happened to become personally involved as a (?court) interpreter when the pilot of the plane, Gary Powers, was tried in Moscow; but not before the United States Government had likewise put out all sorts of cover stories. It was their total exposure that led the American political historian David Wise to conclude that this event marked the first time that many Americans realized that their government lied. In his book "The Politics of (?Lying)," he also explained that this was when the credibility gap emerged. Subsequent events, like the Gulf of Tonkin provocation and Watergate, have certainly not narrowed it. If I may be permitted another brief historical digression, there are quite a few American historians who maintain that the sinking of the British liner Lusitania in May 1915 was caused not by a German submarine's torpedo but by an explosion inside the vessel, intended to whip up a hate campaign in America and push the country into war. If this was indeed the work of American circles intent on war, they had no qualms about sinking a liner with over 1,000 people on board. In one of its reports on the disappearance of the aircraft on the night of August 31, REUTERS said anticommunist hawks had seized on the incident. Indeed, they appear to have been poised to do so.

Nor can one fail to note that this occurred just as antiwar demonstrators in Western Europe began their long hot autumn of protest against the deployment of new American nuclear missiles which are bound to strain the international situation still more. Could not the disappearance of the plane and subsequent hate campaign have been intended as a diversion to take the edge off the protest movement? Not that such a diversion can possibly succeed in deceiving people for long.

The Soviet statements on Friday and Saturday expressed regret for the loss of life that occurred, but they also pointed to where the responsibility for this provocation lies. Some of the British newspapers pride themselves on their investigative journalism. Instead of echoing the biased American version of this happening, they would be acting more wisely by putting their investigative talents to work and indentifying the hawks who are really to blame for sending flight 007 on its last mission.

Portuguese Ask Explanation

LD052046 Lisbon in Portuguese to Europe 1900 GMT 5 Sep 83

[Text] Portugal asked the Soviet Union today for a formal explanation concerning the incident with a South Korean Boeing 747 airliner. The explanation was asked by the director general of political affairs at the Foreign Ministry, Antonio vaz Pereira, when he received the Soviet charge d'affaires in Lisbon.

According to a Foreign Ministry spokesman, the audience was at the Soviet diplomat's request and had been scheduled some time ago. The two diplomats also discussed matters pertaining to Portuguese-Soviet relations.

Italians Refuse Aeroflot Service

LD061819 Rome International Service in Italian 1730 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] This morning again, as happened 2 days ago, the service staff at Malpensa airport withheld their labor on two Aeroflot flights, the Soviet airline company, in protest against the downing of the South Korean jumbo last Thursday.

FRG'S VOGEL ASKS REFUSAL OF NEW U.S. WEAPONS

PM061207 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In Whose Interests?"]

[Text] Bonn, 2 Sep -- H.-J. Vogel, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] Bundestag faction, has sent Federal Chancellor H. Kohl an open letter which says in particular: "The Conference Committee of the two houses of the U.S. Congress has adopted two recommendations which are now to be presented to the Senate and the House of Representatives for a vote within the framework of the Congressional decisions on the 1984 budget: The issue concerns the allocation of money for the production of neutron warheads and the so-called binary chemical weapons.

"Both decisions particularly affect the FRG's interests. Without doubt, the FRG would be a potential site for the deployment of neutron weapons, since they would be added to the category of U.S. battlefield nuclear weapons, which are mainly deployed on our territory.

"It is also thought very likely that at least a proportion of the new U.S. chemical weapons will be deployed in the FRG. Especially since the U.S. Defense Department's new concepts also envisage the use of chemical warheads on delivery vehicles for the so-called aim of suppression..."

"The manufacture and, in particular, the deployment of this new category of weapons of mass destruction do not strengthen security but, on the contrary, weaken it. The production of neutron, as of binary weapons will only lead to a new round in the arms race. Congress' decision on the allocation of budget resources for these new types of weapons cannot meet German interests or correctly conceived Western interests."

On behalf of the SPD Bundestag faction, H.-J. Vogel called on the federal chancellor to make an official statement that the FRG Government rejects the deployment of these new systems on West German territory. "We expect the FRG Government to undertake a political initiative with the U.S. Administration," the letter stresses, "and in particular we expect an appeal to the U.S. Congress expressing our concern at the production of the new types of weapons."

ARRESTS 'EXCEEDED NEED' AT FRG PEACE RALLY

LD041412 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 4 Sep 83

[Text] Bonn September 4 TASS -- "'Law enforcement officers' repeatedly employed baton charges... water cannon were used and specially trained dogs were set loose on five occasions to disperse demonstrators... 305 out of 800 demonstrators have been arrested." This is how West German news agencies describe a 24-hour symbolic blockade by peace campaigners of entrances to the American military base in Bitburg, Rheinland-Palatinate.

This action was only one in a series of demonstrations started on September 1 on the international day of struggle for peace during which West German anti-war campaigners protest against the NATO plans to turn the country's territory into a launching pad for new American medium-range nuclear missiles.

Gert Bastian and Petra Kelly, Bundestag deputies from the "Greens" Party, addressing the mass closing rally, charged that the police action far exceeded the need to maintain order during the demonstration. By the way, the two prominent West German political figures were also detained for an "identity check".

It is indicative that according to the police, the demonstration passed on the whole without "use of violence".

'CLAIMS' ON WEST BERLIN 'AT ODDS' WITH AGREEMENT

LD030536 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 83 First Edition 85

[Viktor Kabanov "Commentator's Column": "Tested by Time"]

[Text] West Berlin -- Twelve years have passed since the USSR, the United States, Britain and France signed on September 3, 1971, an agreement on West Berlin. It became possible thanks to the persevering efforts of the USSR and other socialist countries and also to the reasonable position of sober minded politicians in Western countries. At present hardly anyone will call in question the need for that agreement.

This conclusion was also drawn by the recent conference sponsored by the West Berlin based Aspen Institute. Transit communication through the territory of the GDR was put on a firm contractual basis. Tensions were on the whole removed both in West Berlin and around it. Regrettably, at present certain West German politicians would like to view West Berlin as one of their lands and every now and then invite foreign visitors to it. This is how it was recently during the visits to West Berlin by British Prime Minister M. Thatcher, U.S. President R. Reagan, and U.S. Vice President G. Bush. Bonn leaders often make visits here to act out their own form of "political show" in the cold war spirit and to make claims to this city -- claims which are absolutely unlawful.

Symptomatically, the revival of "fuss around West Berlin," the commentary says, has become particularly noticeable during the recent period as a propaganda campaign has been stepped up by the NATO top brass in connection with the approaching deployment, announced by them, of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Those West German figures, some times high placed, who are consistently contributing to revanchist sentiments have also reared their heads in this situation. Every now and then they make statements which are absolutely at odds with the quadripartite agreement, according to the basic clause whereby West Berlin is not a part of the Federal Republic of Germany and cannot be governed by it either today or in the future.

West Berlin needs peace and tranquility. Its population of almost two million do not want their city to become a testing range for the "Cold War" warriors and are opposed to any attempts to revive the erstwhile bad reputation of West Berlin as a "frontline city." This can only be guaranteed by the strict and consistent observance of the letter and the spirit of the quadripartite accords on West Berlin achieved in 1971.

SOVIET NAVY CONDUCTS MANEUVERS IN TYRRHENIAN SEA

LD031652 Rome International Service in Italian 1555 GMT 3 Sep 83

[Text] Starting on 25 August and continuing for the next few days, Soviet Navy units carried out naval exercises in the waters of the Tyrrhenian Sea. Their intensive activities during the exercises were predominantly antisubmarine operations.

This is the first time that Soviet warships have pushed to the limits of Italian territorial waters. They operated between the islands of Ustica and Capri and then 30 nautical miles off Cagliari in Sardinia. The Soviet fleet consisted of a cruiser which can serve as a helicopter carrier, of the "Moskva" class, three gunboats, and a number of frigates, as well as support units.

Units of the Italian Navy, including the frigate "Caribiniere" and antisubmarine planes of the Air Force constantly shadowed the activity of the Soviet fleet which remained in international waters. A detailed report has been sent to Defense Minister Giovanni Spadolini.

MALTSEV FETES SWEDISH ENVOY DE GEER ON DEPARTURE

PM061513 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Connection With Departure for Home"]

[Text] V.F. Maltsev, USSR first deputy foreign minister, gave a luncheon 2 September in honor of C. De Geer, Swedish ambassador to the USSR, in connection with the latter's departure for home.

SOVIET REPORTAGE FOCUSES ON U.S. ROLE IN LEBANON

Full Cooperation With Israel

PM060930 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Sep 83 First Edition p 3

["Military-Political Review" by international observer V. Vinogradov: "Near East: Washington's New Front"]

[Text] The smoke from conflagrations hangs over the Lebanese capital. The residential districts are being subjected to intensive artillery and mortar shelling. There are many casualties among the civilian population. Considerable damage has been inflicted on the city. The international airport, on whose terrain shells and mines are frequently falling, is out of action.

A picture as tragic as it is familiar. It was in just this way, district after district, methodically and cold-bloodedly, that the Israeli military destroyed the Lebanese capital a year ago. But in this case it is a matter of events which happened not 12 months ago but a few days ago. And the shelling of the residential district of Beirut, which resulted in deaths among the civilian population, as undertaken this time by U.S. Marines from the "multinational forces."

It is clear from the statements of U.S. leaders that the pretext for these actions was the farfetched excuse of the "need" to safeguard the security of the U.S. Marines. "The logic," the 1 September TASS statement notes, "is more than strange: First troops are brought into a foreign country, then they kill its inhabitants to safeguard their 'security.'"

According to a statement by U.S. spokesmen, Cobra military helicopters, armed with missiles, and 155 mm artillery pieces and heavy mortars were used. Moreover, the command of the U.S. contingent in Lebanon threatened that the Marines would "resort to even more resolute measures" and warned that "the entire might of the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean is on their side." And to back up these threats the U.S. naval task force headed by the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier "Dwight D. Eisenhower" came within 3 miles of the Lebanese coast in the Beirut region. THE WASHINGTON POST reported that the Reagan administration has taken a "preliminary decision" to use the aircraft on board the aircraft carrier to bomb Lebanese territory.

That is the true worth of all the assurances given by President Reagan in August last year. At that time, in sending Marines to Lebanon on the pretext of "safeguarding peace" in that country, the White House incumbent asserted that the U.S. troops will "in no circumstances remain in Lebanon more than 30 days" and "will take no direct part in the fighting." But the U.S. Marines are still in that Arab country. And their numbers over this time have been increased on two occasions and have now been brought up to 1,200 men. And according to a THE NEWYORK TIMES report, the Pentagon is planning a new increase of another 1,000 men in the U.S. military contingent in Lebanon. That is with regard to President Reagan's first assertion. As for the second one, the U.S. troops in Lebanon have essentially begun the same operations as the Israeli occupiers.

The Washington administration's violation of its own commitments and the White House's frank desire to expand U.S. military interference in Lebanon have alarmed even some congressmen. ABC television has reported that they have accused the President of breaking the War Powers Act and demanded the withdrawal of the U.S. troops in Lebanon.

In an attempt to stifle or at least weaken the mounting criticism of his recent actions in the Near East, Reagan has sent a special letter to the leaders of both houses of Congress. In it the President claimed that the Marines' "continued presence" in Lebanon is "vitally important for as long as troops are there." As though in confirmation of these words, reports are coming in from Lebanon that the U.S. contingent has embarked on the installation and fitting out of "winter quarters."

It is appropriate to recall here that there is already a memorial wall in Washington on which are carved the names of almost 60,000 Americans who met with an ignominious end during the United States' shameful Vietnam adventure. Thus, the U.S. newspaper THE ARMY TIMES recently published a notable drawing in connection with the death of U.S. "military adviser" Schaufelberger in El Salvador. The drawing showed a memorial wall like the Vietnam one with Schaufelberger's name heading the list of the dead. What is the result: Is it time now to erect another wall in the U.S. capital, this time in connection with the Lebanese front? Two U.S. Marines have already died in that country. And they are just the first victims among the U.S. servicemen in Lebanon as a result of the aggressive U.S. actions. After all, State Department spokesman Hughes has stated that the White House has examined the question of a "new role" for the U.S. contingent from the "multinational forces" in Lebanon.

It is not hard to guess what this "new role" will be. As a result of combat operations launched by the U.S. Marines, the blood of Lebanese has already been shed. According to the latest reports, 83 people have been killed there and hundreds wounded. Casting aside the camouflage of some kind of "peacemaking efforts" -- camouflage of which it has grown tired -- Washington has acted in its usual capacity -- as a strongarm man and stifler of the people's freedom. Not satisfied with their functions as occupiers, the U.S. Armed Forces are conducting combat operations in Lebanon "according to the book," using aircraft and artillery. Thus the United States, which is the true inspirer and organizer of Israel's piratical attack on Lebanon, has emerged from the wings directly onto the stage of the Lebanon tragedy.

One cannot fail to see that it was precisely this turn of events which was initially programmed by the makers of U.S. Near East policy. Seeking to occupy a bridgehead in the region, reverse or delay the process of progressive transformations, and gain the right to dispose of Arab oil without control, the United States put the Israeli military into action as a big stick.

But alongside the reports on the sharp aggravation of the Near East situation, newspapers front-paged another report. Begin has decided to resign. Formally this decision is prompted by "personal reasons." But, of course, that it not the point.

The Lebanon tragedy was the grim apotheosis of the terrorist premier's career. The Israeli people were also the victims of this adventurist policy. The country is experiencing a severe economic crisis aggravated by the astronomical military expenditure, which has increased immoderately because of the invasion of Lebanon and the continuing occupation of vast regions of that country. Suffice it to say that Israel's current debts have reached \$21 billion. As a result of the "supertough" stance taken by the Tel Aviv ruling clique, attempts at a genuine and fair Near East settlement have been totally blocked.

Israel is thus deadlocked on all salients. Its adventurist expansionist course is bankrupt, and it is obvious that under these conditions those who determine Tel Aviv's policy have resolved to rid themselves of such an odious and discredited figure as Begin. The Washington reaction to the announcement of his resignation was highly indicative. A White House spokesman said that the United States expects to continue "full cooperation" with Israel on questions of "the Lebanon crisis."

In other words, Washington has hastened to assure Tel Aviv that U.S. support for its aggressive course remains unaltered. It is also indicative that it is precisely now that an agreement has been signed between the United States and Israel on the supply of a further 75 F-16 fighter bombers to the Israeli Air Force.

But, of course, the United States is relying not only on the Israeli "big stick." To the propagandist din of all kinds of "peace initiatives," Washington has sought and achieved U.S. military superiority in the Near East. Initially subunits from the interventionist U.S. Rapid Deployment Force under "multinational" insignia settled in Egypt's Sinai Peninsula and then in Lebanon.

Although the militarist coloring of Washington's "peacemaking efforts" was thus visible to the naked eye, Washington did not stop throwing dust in people's eyes with their aid. Thus, a year ago the noisily billed Reagan "Near East settlement plan" was made public. However, not a single leading Arab country came out in its support. Habib's replacement by McFarlane as the President's special envoy in the Near East did not help either.

It is not hard to understand the reason for this blatant failure. The "Reagan plan" failed to reflect the key problem of a Near East settlement -- the Palestinian problem. It does not contain a word about recognizing the PLO, which is the sole and legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, nor about the Palestinians' right to create their own independent state. This plan is an attempt to impose on the Arabs a solution which suits the United States and Israel. It is a continuation of the Camp David policy aimed at splitting the Arab countries.

In an interview with AFP Y. Arafat pointed to the hypocritical nature of the Reagan administration's Near East policy, stressing that Washington has not kept a single one of the promises which it lavished on the Arabs -- to halt Israel's further colonization of the occupied Arab territories, and to ensure the security of the Palestinian civilian population in Lebanon and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from that country. At the same time the Palestinian leader stated that "the PLO is the most important factor in a peace settlement in the Near East. Neither Israel nor anyone else will succeed in destroying the Palestine resistance movement."

The representative international conference on the Palestine question convened by a UN General Assembly decision and now underway in Geneva's Palais des Nations displays the world public's grave concern at the Near East conflict and its sincere desire to liquidate it. This is the first time that a broad forum has been convened to discuss the Palestinian problem. It was preceded by long, thorough work. After all, it is a case of the destiny of an entire people -- the Arab peoples of Palestine -- who for nearly 40 years now have been denied the rights which other peoples enjoy, a people who are being harshly oppressed and suppressed by Israel's Zionist ruling clique.

There is no doubt that there is only one realistic path for resolving the Palestinian problem -- and in a broader sense the Near East problem: the satisfaction of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights and aspirations, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territories, and the halting of Israel's aggressive policy. It was this that was emphasized in the greetings message from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers to the conference participants. And no military intervention on which Israel is counting and to which Washington has now resorted can help settle the conflict. It can only extend it.

U.S. 'Expanding Interference'

PM061329 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Sep 83 Second Edition p 5

[TASS dispatch: "Aircraft Carriers Off the Shores of Lebanon"]

[Text] Washington, 2 Sep -- The United States is expanding the scale of its armed interference in Lebanon's internal affairs.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the Reagan administration has adopted a "preliminary decision" to use fighter-bombers aboard the aircraft carrier "Eisenhower" to carry out bombing raids on Lebanese territory. This aircraft carrier has now approached to within 3-5 miles of the Lebanese coast, so that the aircraft aboard take only a few minutes to reach Beirut. Commenting on the administration's plans, THE WASHINGTON POST rightly points out that they could lead to "the most dangerous international consequences."

As THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, President Reagan has ordered 2,000 more Marines to be transferred to the Mediterranean region. They will be in direct proximity to Beirut, so as to provide support for the 1,350 Marines already on shore in case of need. According to Pentagon spokesmen, the extra contingent of Marines will be sent by ship from the Mombasa military base (Kenya) and will reach the Lebanese coast in about a week. The subunits being transferred to Lebanon will be equipped with tanks, mechanized infantry combat vehicles, artillery, antitank missiles, machineguns, VTOL aircraft, and assault and transport helicopters. According to military experts, the nature of these arms attests that the Marines are being sent to Lebanon to carry out large-scale combat operations of an offensive nature.

According to new agencies, the French aircraft carrier "Foch" has left the port of Toulon for the Lebanese coast, where it will join the ships of the U.S. 6th Fleet. As is known, the French forces are part of the so-called "multinational forces" in Lebanon.

Sinking Into 'Lebanese Quagmire'

PM061058 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Sep 83 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Vladimir Kudryavtsev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Biting Off More Than They Can Chew"]

[Text] Of all the world's regions which U.S. imperialist policy has turned into dangerous hotbeds of war, the Near East is perhaps best suited to serve as a barometer indicating to what extent the Reagan administration's political course is at variance with the demands of present-day reality. Quite recently, in a kind of program statement to the convention of the American Legion, the U.S. President claimed that the Americans are not hatching any plans to seize foreign territories and have no intention of assuming the role of a world gendarme. However, he said, "as the most powerful Western country, our country is duty-bound to render assistance to our friends in the cause of preserving peace." In that statement every word is a lie because, as actual facts show, all Washington's steps in the international arena lead not toward peace but toward war, the United States plays the part of a world gendarme everywhere, and U.S. ruling circles are totally indifferent where the interests of other countries and peoples are concerned.

The U.S. ruling circles, to justify their aggressive foreign policy, as a rule resort to casting aspersions on the Soviet Union, accusing it of generating some kind of "Soviet threat" which the United States allegedly is called upon to eliminate or neutralize. However, this kind of propaganda trick makes the United States unable to realistically assess and analyze the prevailing situation and turns it into a victim of its own propaganda lie.

This has been the case with the notorious "Reagan plan," announced 1 September 1982, which claimed that it cleared the way toward peace in the Near East. Chasing after the specter of the "Soviet threat" in the Near East, the United States has ignored the lessons of Camp David, which testified to the Arab peoples' reluctance to be meekly drawn into the web of U.S. propaganda. Maybe it was this that "inspired" Reagan to the kind of repetition of Camp David in the shape of the September plan. This plan completely ignored the central problem in the Near East -- the Palestinian problem -- and even pursued to aim of eliminating this problem through the absorption of the Palestinians by neighboring countries.

The plan envisaged Jordan's involvement in the Camp David scheme. However, all this was based on unrealistic premises and accompanied by a brazen attempt to turn the Near East as quickly as possible into an anti-Soviet bridgehead.

The United States miscalculated in Lebanon, too. It reckoned that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon would lead to the physical annihilation of the Palestinian resistance movement or to rendering it leaderless through the physical liquidation of PLO leadership. Having slipped up as regards this (the Palestinian struggle continues, and the Palestinian problem remains, even more acutely than before, the Near East's main problem), the United States has suffered a failure also in another respect: Having forced Lebanon to conclude a "peace" agreement with Israel it then proved unable to translate it into reality. Syria did not give in to U.S. pressure and continues to guard pan-Arab interests in Lebanon.

Israel, with U.S. support, is trying to compensate for the failure of its main venture by partitioning Lebanon and turning the south of the country into an Israeli buffer zone. But the whole situation in Lebanon shows that neither the United States nor Israel knows how the Lebanon adventure will end for them.

This conclusion is, in my view, corroborated by Begin's intention to retire. Israel's situation holds out no promise for him either externally or internally. And while policy, it can be assumed, is hardly likely to change much with Begin's departure, the change of prime minister, it is hoped in Tel Aviv, will nonetheless somewhat allay the mounting dissatisfaction in the depths of the Israeli society. As can be seen, the Lebanon adventure has not strengthened bellicose Israel's positions but has considerably weakened them and created additional difficulties as well.

The Reagan administration's stances with regard to Lebanon did not bring their creators the expected haul, but on the contrary have been a contributing factor in the Washington "peacemakers'" self-exposure. When Reagan sent the U.S. Marines to Lebanon, he pledged to withdraw them within 30 days. A year has passed and the Marines have not only not left Lebanese territory, but their strength has increased to 1,350 officers and men. Having officially pledged to guarantee the safety of the Palestinians who stayed behind in Beirut after the departure of the Palestinian Armed Forces, the U.S. ruling circles kept silent when the massacre of the Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila camps was staged. Now U.S. official circles are stating without the least embarrassment that it is impossible to say when the Marines will be withdrawn from Lebanon and, what is more, there is even talk of increasing the numerical strength of the U.S. Armed Forces in Lebanon with a contingent of naval ships concentrated near the shores of that Arab country. Judging by the events of the past few days, the U.S. military are sinking deeper and deeper into the Lebanese quagmire which they themselves have created.

The U.S. Marines are openly interfering in Lebanon's internal affairs. They are taking part in military operations against the national patriotic forces, thus exacerbating the internal political struggle. The first casualties among the Marines in fact mark the beginning of genuine U.S. intervention in Lebanon. By shedding the blood of Arab patriots, the United States has de facto declared war on the Arabs. Having done its utmost to exacerbate the internal political struggle in Lebanon, the United States has itself now fallen into the maelstrom of events which may develop contrary to Washington's will and aspirations. The events in Lebanon confirm yet again: the germs of new "Vietnams" inevitably emerge in every U.S. adventure carried out in conditions of complete disregard for the interests of peoples and states in one region or another.

Question: How do you explain the fact that ground control in charge of this international flight did nothing to prevent the Boeing 747 from going off course?

Answer: I too would like to know the truth about the exceedingly odd behavior not only of the aircraft's crew but also of the organs controlling air traffic on this route, in this case the United States and Japan. In accordance with international treaties they, as states which have signed these treaties, are obliged to control an aircraft's flight.

As we can see from what has happened, this was not the case. It was as if the aircraft had stolen into our territory by night. And there is no doubt that it was a deliberate act, intended to be a crude provocation. It is easy to guess who would have wanted this provocation and why.

Question: Could the Soviet airman see that it was a passenger aircraft?

Answer: No, not at night. The aircraft was flying without lights and in outline it is very much like the U.S. RC-135 reconnaissance aircraft. The pilot might well have failed to see the function of the intruder.

Question: The 2 September TASS statement says that this is by no means the only deliberate violation of Soviet state borders, including the border in the Far East, by U.S. aircraft. Could you say something further on this score?

Answer: This year alone U.S. military aircraft, including deck-landing aircraft, have violated the USSR border in the vicinity of the Kuril Islands on nine occasions. Moreover, there have been violations by U.S. aircraft in the Bering Strait near Ratmanov Island. All these facts indicate that the U.S. Air Force and Navy are doing this deliberately. Since, as an analysis of the crude violations has shown, they were not accidental, it all bears the stamp of a direct and sanctioned provocation. There is no doubt that these facts do not aid the cause of improving interstate relations between our countries and can only give rise to greater suspicion and mistrust of one another.

Air Defense Forces Command

PM061227 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 7 Sep 83 p 1

[Unsigned Report: "This Is How It Happened: The Boeing Was Flying With Its Lights Switched Off..." published under the rubric "Authoritative Opinion"]

[Text] The Soviet public's attention is now focused on the impudent provocation committed in the Soviet Union's air space in the region of Kamchatka and Sakhalin Island.

How did this actually happen? This was the question asked by the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Editorial Board of the Command of the Soviet Union's Air Defense Forces.

Answer: First of all we consider it our duty to inform LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's readers that the incursion into the Soviet Union's air space by the violator aircraft is, in our most deeply held belief, a provocation hatched a long time ago and carefully prepared by the U.S. CIA.

It must be mentioned that this is not the first time the CIA has used passenger airliners for such purposes.

It is universally known that Boeing passenger aircraft are equipped with modern control instruments and also that they can be fitted with the most advanced intelligence instruments to carry out highly secret assignments.

At 2031 Moscow time in the evening of 1 September the alarm signal sounded at one of the control points in our Far Eastern air defense system, which has been for a long time the target of attention by uninvited U.S. visitors. Major Vasilii Konstantinovich Kazmin, duty air defense pilot, immediately took off in the air above his zone to intercept the violator aircraft.

Our pilots were already aware that this was not the first such incident. They also knew, of course, that U.S. military aircraft violated our air frontier many times in April 1983 over the Kuril chain. There is no doubt that they also recalled the provocative flight by the spy-pilot Powers, who was shot down over the Urals on 1 May 1960....

Fully in accordance with international rules, Major Kazmin did everything possible and necessary so that the crew of the violator aircraft could land at one of our airports. This failed to produce any results, however. With its lights switched off, the violator maintained its illegal course over Soviet territory and more precisely over the southern part of our Sakhalin Island. There it was again intercepted by another pilot who also tried, by light signals and air maneuvers, to indicate to the violator aircraft the necessity to descend and land at a Soviet airport. The crew of the violator aircraft, however, continued in their failure to react to the signals. Our pilot was forced to fire warning shots with tracer bullets, but even this warning failed to have any effect: The violator aircraft continued its flight toward the Sea of Japan.

Now an anti-Soviet campaign has been launched in the West on the initiative of President Reagan. Its organizers are attempting to convince the world public that our pilots were apparently informed that they were having to deal with a civilian aircraft. According to the Goebbels recipe: "Throw enough mud and some of it is bound to stick." And this is what is happening. Our pilots did not know that they had to deal with a civilian aircraft and could not have known this. This is mainly because the Boeing was flying with its lightswitched off. Furthermore, as it is well known, the Boeing's configuration is very similar to the outline of the U.S. RC-135 military intelligence aircraft. Such aircraft, as has been said, fly in considerable numbers along Soviet air frontiers.

It is clear that this political provocation pursues far-reaching goals of complicating the already tense situation in the world. As regards our position, we declare with utmost responsibility from the pages of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA: The Soviet Air Force pilots, loyal and devoted sons of their fatherland, have always, everywhere, and in everything strictly observed and continue to observe all requirements of international aviation laws. This is what happened this time, too. They did everything to lead the violator aircraft to one of the Soviet airports. The incumbent U.S. Administration and the CIA are to blame for this tragic story.

Such is the truth.

III. 7 Sep 83

C 10

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
NORTHEAST ASIA

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA CARRIES LETTERS ON PLANE INCIDENT

PM071057 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Sep 83 Second Edition p 3

[TASS account of readers' letters on KAL airliner incident]

[Text] Fueling Hysteria

We are angered by the unseemly position adopted by the United States and its NATO allies, using the incident involving the South Korean aircraft to fuel anti-Soviet hysteria. This demonstrates once again that the White House administration and the U.S. President himself are creating new "grounds" for slandering the USSR and instilling hatred of the Soviet land on the basis of a provocation of their own making.

But it is easy for anyone with any common sense to grasp the significance of this affair and, moreover, to see what could have caused the Boeing 747 to enter Soviet airspace. How else can one explain the fact that the aircraft deviated hundreds of kilometers from its international route, failed to give any information about itself, and did not reply to repeated efforts to establish contact with it?

We Soviet people have always wanted only peace, but we will never let anyone encroach on our sovereignty, our security.

Hero of Socialist Labor V. Zinovyev, senior blast furnace attendant at the Donetsk V.I. Lenin Metallurgical Plant

Stigmatizing

The U.S. provocation carried out by the South Korean aircraft that invaded our country's airspace was another public demonstration that the Reagan administration will stop at nothing to fuel way hysteria, heat up the international atmosphere, and wreck the Geneva talks. You do not need special scientific knowledge to see that, given the presence of a computer and double or triple checking systems on board the Boeing, the aircraft's deviation from its flight path hundreds of kilometers into Soviet territory was an act which looked as if it had been planned by U.S. intelligence services.

Lithuanian scientists, like the rest of the Soviet people, angrily stigmatize the provocateurs who are capable of sacrificing human lives without a pang of conscience.

Hero of Socialist Labor Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences N. Kubilyus, rector of Vilnius State University

U.S. ACCOUNTS OF AIRCRAFT INCIDENT DISPUTED

Reagan, USSR Statements Contrasted

LD062237 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1935 GMT 6 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Hello comrades. Foreign news agencies are flashing reports on the Soviet Government statement.

In particular they set forth the part of the statement which says that the air defense command of the area into which the South Korean plane intruded, carefully analyzed the activities of the intruder and reached the conclusion that a spy plane on a special mission was in the airspace of the USSR. Since, despite numerous warnings the intruder plane did not obey the request to fly to a Soviet airport and tried to escape, an air defense interceptor fighter carried out a command from the command post to intercept the flight. Such actions are in full accordance with USSR state border law.

In intercepting the intruder plane, the Soviet pilots could not have known that it was a civil aircraft -- it was flying without navigation lights at night in poor visibility and did not respond to the signals transmitted.

The assertion of the U.S. President that the Soviet pilots knew that this was a civil aircraft have absolutely no connection with reality.

The agencies stress that the Soviet Government expresses regret at the death of innocent people and shares the grief of the relatives and dear ones. However, it states that the entire responsibility for the tragedy lies utterly and completely with the U.S. leaders. U.S. officials carried out a major reconnaissance operation using a civil aircraft, consciously subjecting its passengers to the threat of death. And in so doing, as we have already said, Washington is fanning an unprecedented anti-Soviet campaign over the incident involving the South Korean plane.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the initiators of this campaign count on using it to strengthen international tension, to wreck arms limitation talks and to create conditions under which the United States could pursue a policy from a position of strength. In his television speech, U.S. President Reagan launched crude slanderous attacks against the Soviet Union, and at the same time called on the U.S. Congress to approve all the requests of the administration for the program for deploying new U.S. MX strategic missiles.

Hart, an influential senator, who is seeking Democratic party nomination for the post of president, said in connection with this that any attempt to establish a link between the incident involving the South Korean plane and the plan to deploy missiles is a dangerous tactic.

In his television speech, President Reagan tried, without giving any proof, to explain the intrusion into USSR airspace by the South Korean plane as some sort of computer mistake and to dump all the responsibility for what happened on the Soviet Union. Even Cho Joon Goon, vice president of Korean Air Lines, the South Korean airline company, does not agree with such explanations. His is the very company whose aircraft violated the Soviet border. As the Japanese agency JIJI TSUSHIN reports, Cho Joon Goon stated today in Tokyo that his company must bear full responsibility for the loss [gibel] of the aircraft. He also said: So far we have no positive explanation as to why the plane was in that area.

In the opinion of many specialists the plane did not intrude into Soviet airspace by mistake. Its route was worked out in detail in advance.

The opinion of an observer with the Greek paper RIZOSPASTIS, for example, is that the aim of the deliberate deviation from course was to carry out spying from the air and to test the sensitivity of Soviet radar at the altitude at which modern U.S. missiles fly.

'Discrepancies' in U.S. Account

LD070346 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Excerpts] And now another look at Washington's provocations against the Soviet Union involving the South Korean plane:

World opinion is understandably alarmed and indignant that the United States authorities refuse to explain how it was that the South Korean plane appeared over Soviet territory, though they and the Japanese authorities were responsible for ensuring the plane's safe flight along an authorized route.

Those who follow reports by Western news agencies and the American press more closely than President Reagan or the staff of the Voice of America may have noted many discrepancies in the accounts of what happened to the intruder plane in Soviet airspace. Here are some of them: Originally, the CIA described the Soviet interceptor aircraft as a MIG-23. Later the CIA changed the story. It said the plane was a SU-15, while a MIG-23 was one of the onlookers. How can the CIA give such details without disclosing any information about the intruder plane?

The administration categorically denied that RC-135 planes based around the perimeter of Soviet borders in the United States and also Alaska and Japan ever violated Soviet airspace. This was confirmed by Jeane Kirkpatrick in the United Nations Security Council today. However the national daily PRAVDA on Monday cited days in 1982 and this year when such violations occurred and that notes of protest were lodged with the United States.

The indignant staff of the Voice of America very emotionally exposes the Soviet Union saying that civil aircraft cannot be used for spying, because there are so many intelligence gathering satellites. The trouble is that some U.S. sources said the opposite, namely, that aircraft are ideal for such missions, especially if they fly at a distance of 150 miles from a military facility. Civil aircraft can register the frequencies used by air defense ground control centers, and also the reaction time of interceptor aircraft to takeoff orders.

The emotional American President and the Voice of America have no time to analyze all these reports. They are too busy whipping up an anti-Soviet campaign. But when a calculated political gamble is on, there should be no discrepancies, especially when they play against those who organized the provocation.

Many political leaders and news analysts see a link between President Reagan's campaign of provocations and his policy of holding up arms limitation talks and deploying American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. From the very beginning of his presidency Ronald Reagan worked to worsen relations with the Soviet Union and has effectively bogged down all negotiations that might curb the arms race and guarantee worldwide security.

Unanswered Questions

LD061900 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Sep 83

[From the Vremya newscast; video talk by APN Political Observer Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Greetings, comrades. Yesterday, or, by Moscow time, this morning, the U.S. President spoke once again, uttering rebukes and demanding from us explanations and apologies in connection with the loss of the South Korean aircraft that was on flight 007 to Seoul and that did not arrive there.

Before rising to new demagogic heights about the value of human life, before demanding explanations and apologies, it would not be bad if the President provided the answers to at least seven questions, himself.

First question: Why was the aircraft flying on an incorrect course over Soviet territory? It was a Boeing 747 with navigation equipment such that it is technologically impossible to become lost. This is said by Western pilots who have flown on this aircraft. There was malicious intent and the President must know this, or at least admit it; but he keeps silent.

Second question: Why was the aircraft's course not corrected on instructions from the ground? The U.S. and Japanese flight control services conducted constant observation of the flight; why did they not correct it? Here also there was malicious intent and the President must know it, or at least admit it; but he keeps silent.

Third question: Why was the behavior of the aircraft like that of a thief in someone else's house and was provocative toward the Soviet air defenses? By the way, the U.S. press today is writing about the widespread practice of equipped civilian aircraft belonging to countries friendly to the United States with instruments to collect intelligence data. Surely, there was malicious intent here, also; and the President must know it or at least admit it; but he keeps silent.

Fourth question: Why was there a U.S. RC-135 spy-plane in the area of the incident? This was confirmed by Reagan himself. But spies fly behind every flight; why was Flight 007 given particular attention? A special accompanying aircraft is evidence of malicious intent. The President must know this but he keeps silent.

Fifth question: Why did all of this occur in a region that is marked on all navigation maps as a forbidden zone of particular strategic importance to the national security of the USSR? The President should know. But he keeps silent.

Sixth question: Why were attempts not made to communicate with the Soviet side? It is easy to lift a telephone and call Moscow. There was sufficient time -- 2 and 1/2 hours. And the President surely knows this but he keeps silent.

Seventh question -- the final and important one in any search for the truth: Who benefits from this?

And if the President in his speech answered these questions and not replaced this with crude anti-Soviet abuse, he would have been able to pose much more correctly the question of the responsibility for what happened.

There are no answers yet to the first six questions. But the seventh, the main one, who benefits, can be answered now.

Of course, we do not benefit. It seems as if even the moment was specially chosen, on the eve of a hot fall, the upsurge of the antiwar movement, a few days before the resumption of the Geneva talks on nuclear arms in Europe and the meeting of foreign ministers in Madrid, as if specially to order, to spoil everything.

And this benefits official Washington. It was not for nothing that in his speech Reagan pointed to what has happened as confirmation of the correctness of his policy aimed at an arms build-up.

III. 7 Sep 83

C 14

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
NORTHEAST ASIA

And Paul Nitze, the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks in Geneva, has already spoken about their inevitable linkage with the aircraft incident.

The most dangerous thing now is if these calculations by the authors of the provocation, their plans for a sharp aggravation of the international situation, are justified.

In conclusion, I shall cite the opinion of UN secretary General Perez de Cuellar. He expressed the hope that the incident with the South Korean aircraft would not have serious consequences for the already explosive international situation. He said: The incident should not in any event serve as a pretext for the stopping or blocking of the talks on disarmament and detente.

SOVIET JURIST JUSTIFIES ACTION OVER AIR INTRUSION

'Maximum Patience' Shown

LD062124 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Talk by Professor Nilolay Aleksandrovich Ushakov, doctor of legal sciences]

[Text] The American ruling circles are attempting to create a completely false impression that the actions of the Soviet air defense forces are illegal, while the ill-intentioned behavior of the intruder plane and the navigation services of Japan which were responsible for its flight were almost totally permissible. But this is not so at all. I have in front of me the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944.

Article 6 provides that regular international air links cannot be carried out over the territory or on the territory of states party to the agreement, except with special permission, or at the cost of sanctions from that state, and in accordance with the condition of such permission or sanction. Accordingly, a state has the right not to allow, and to stop any illegal intrusion into its air space by foreign flying craft.

With this purpose, special international regulations were established for flights according to which states can use their interceptor planes to force the intruder aircraft to cease its illegal intrusion into its territory and make that craft land. It obviously follows that the Soviet interceptor planes were acting perfectly legally, in full accordance with the established international regulations of flight. What is more, the Soviet air defense organs showed the maximum patience in order to make the intruder plane submit to the established requirements. In this manner, the responsibility for what happened, in agreement with international law, lies with those who prepared and carried out, with deliberately provocative aims, an illegal invasion of Soviet air space.

Reaction 'Totally Natural'

LD071044 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 7 Sep 83

[Talk by Professor Nikolay Aleksandrovich Ushakov, doctor of legal sciences]

[Text] A noisy anti-Soviet campaign has been unleashed in the United States.

American ruling circles are attempting to create the completely false impression that the actions by the Soviet air defense forces are illegal, and that the ill-intentioned behavior of the intruding plane and of the Japanese navigation services, which were responsible for its flight, are almost completely permissible.

However, this is totally wrong. Measures by any state to protect its air space from any foreign incursion into it are not only totally natural, but also vitally essential. For it is a matter of safeguarding the territorial inviolability of states, encroachments upon which, according to the generally recognized norms of international law, are totally impermissible. I have before me the 1944 Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation. In Article 1 it reinforces the generally acknowledged norms that, and I quote that article, the contracting states recognize that each state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace over its territory.

In relation to this generally acknowledged principle of the strict respect of the sovereignty of each state over its airspace the 1944 Chicago Convention has another article, Article 6 which provides that regular international air traffic can be carried out over the territory or to the territory of a contracting state only with special permission or with the approval of that state, and in accordance with the conditions of such permission or approval. Accordingly, a state is entitled not to permit and to stop any illegitimate intrusion into its airspace by foreign aircraft. For this purpose special international regulations for flight have been established, according to which states can use their interceptor planes to force the intruding aircraft to cease the illegitimate incursion into its territory, and to make that craft carry out a landing.

Consequently it is evident that the Soviet interceptor planes were acting completely naturally [zakonomerno]; in full accordance with established international flight regulations. Moreover, the Soviet air defense organs displayed the maximum of effort and patience in order to make the intruding plane comply with the established requirements. All of this, in particular, clearly ensues from the fact that the illegitimate flight by the intruding plane in Soviet airspace lasted for almost 2 and 1/2 hours, and that the plane was flying over a part of Soviet territory which is of particularly great defense significance.

Thus the responsibility for what occurred, in accordance with international law, falls upon those who prepared and implemented, for deliberately provocative purposes, the illegitimate intrusion into Soviet airspace.

JAPAN PUBLISHES PILOT'S CALLS TO 'INTRUDING' JET

LDO71131 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 7 Sep 83

[Text] Japan's National Defense Agency has presented for publication the deciphered recording of the radio calls of the pilots of the Soviet fighter planes to the commander of the aircraft that had crossed into the airspace of the Soviet Union. The calls were transmitted on international frequencies in the course of 50 minutes.

The monitored calls, says the Japanese Defense Agency, show that the commander of the plane did not reply to the requests to name the national belonging [as heard] or the destination of the plane. The published recordings repudiate the deliberately false assertions of the American secretary of state, George Shultz, that the Soviet air-defense planes allegedly did not try to contact the intruding aircraft or warn it.

Even some people in the United States itself are beginning to understand this. Thus Senator Barry Goldwater has said that the Marines should be brought back home since "it is not our business" to use them to carry out "policing functions." A number of congressmen have expressed the same idea.

Time will show how events in Lebanon develop. One thing is clear, however, namely that by its policy in the Near East, the administration itself is tearing off the garb of peacemakers. It appears before the whole world as the worst enemy of Arab peoples, as the brutal invader of foreign lands.

The failure of the "Reagan plan," the hopelessness of the Lebanese adventure, and the gradually growing Arab resistance to Washington's policy are the best indication that in the Near East the U.S. imperialists have bitten off more than they can chew. It may be possible to slow down the national liberation movement, but to halt it or reverse it is patently beyond even U.S. imperialism.

LEBANESE PRESS CARRIES 'LIES' ABOUT USSR POLICY

LD062356 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1630 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Articles containing provocations and gross lies about the Soviet Union and its Middle East policy have appeared recently in some Lebanese newspapers whose owners were well known for their Western tendencies. These articles tried to blame our country for the continuing bloodshed in Lebanon. They accused us of conspiring against peace in Lebanon, of aggravating the situation in this Arab country, and of undermining the efforts to realize the so-called U.S. peace initiative. All this is done because the Soviet Union supports the attitude of Syria and the PLO toward the Lebanese crisis and their way of achieving a just and real settlement in Lebanon.

There is not the slightest doubt, of course, that this filthy campaign is of the making and inspiration of the forces that sparked the criminal war against Lebanon and that are trying to partition this country in order to entrench their military presence in it. It is no accident that all the lies and fabrications against the Soviet policy should end with the call to strengthen the relations between Lebanon and the West which, as they claim, has been and still is a friend and a faithful ally of Lebanon.

The insolence of such allegations truly needs no comment from us. They see the West's friendship and its alliance with Lebanon -- the West refers to the United States and Israel before anyone else -- through the ruins of the Lebanese capital and through the destruction and devastation left behind by the imperialist-Zionist invasion in numerous villages and towns in that unruly land. Statements made by Tel Aviv, on the other hand, make things clearer. The Israeli newspaper YEDI'OT AHARONOT, for example, in debating ways to salvage the humiliating agreement imposed on Lebanon by the United States and Israel, says that, in addition to their military commitments, the Israeli forces in Lebanon should have a political task also. Although the paper does not explain what it means by political task, for the Israeli forces of occupation in Lebanon, we believe that it is not ruled out that this political task includes the engineering of the criminal provocations such as those in Sabra and Shatila last year or launching frenzied and reckless campaigns in the papers like those mentioned at the beginning of this talk.

The thing that attracts attention is the timing of the campaign. The Lebanese newspapers, on the instigation of the Zionists and their allies across the ocean, began to circulate these fabrications and lies, which are designed to sow doubts among the masses about the policy of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, at a time when the imperialist aggression against the Lebanese people has entered a somewhat new stage -- a stage in which the U.S. occupiers have taken direct part in the fighting.

How feeble is Washington's memory. It has soon forgotten the promises of Reagan and his bombastic statements on the purely peaceful mission of the U.S. Marines in Lebanon.

The Soviet Union most firmly warned Washington that the responsibility for the current escalation of the imperialist piracy in Lebanon falls squarely on the United States. Is this not what led the Zionists and their lackeys in Lebanon to try to cast a shadow over the Soviet Union and smear its policy in the Middle East?

EGYPTIAN OPPOSITION LEADER ON U.S. IN LEBANON

LD031625 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 3 Sep 83

[Text] Cairo September 3 TASS -- It is clear to all in the world today that the so-called "multinational peace-keeping force" in Lebanon, above all the U.S. contingent forming its backbone, sees its task in supporting pro-American reactionary forces rather than in keeping peace in that country, Rifaat el-Said, deputy secretary-general of the National Progressive (left-wing) Party of Egypt, declared in a TASS interview. "It will not stop at war on Arab nations, as is the case in Lebanon today, in order to fulfill this task," he said.

Rifaat el-Said recalled repeated statements by U.S. strategy-makers that they will launch intervention in any Persian Gulf state without hesitation, if internal anti-government unrest breaks out there. Washington is bent not only on defending its "interests" in the Middle East by force of arms but also on cultivating U.S. agents in that part of the world.

"My party," he declared, "has from the very outset opposed the Camp David accords, which betrayed the Arabs' cause, not only because they did not promise a comprehensive solution to the Middle East crisis to the Arab nations and not only because they were directed at splitting the pan-Arab front of resistance to Israeli aggression, but also because we were able to see it as a jumping-off board which would enable the U.S. to establish its domination over the Arab world."

The developments that took place after the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the deputy secretary-general of the National Progressive (left-wing) Party of Egypt said, have borne out the correctness of that view. They have become possible only owing to Camp David which split the formerly serried Arab ranks. The Israeli-Lebanese agreement, which Israel imposed on Beirut at gunpoint, is a direct continuation of the Camp David process and an attempt to foist the "U.S. solution" to the existing crisis on the Arabs.

PRAVDA 'HITS' FRENCH 'ROLE' IN U.S. PLANS IN CHAD

PM061322 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 83 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent I. Shchedrov dispatch: "Operation 'Manta'"]

[Text] Paris, 2 Sep -- As I was leaving Paris just 2 months ago it was hard to imagine that in that time such striking changes would occur in the political atmosphere and in sentiments here. For many Frenchmen this August -- usually a quiet month for vacations -- passed under the influence of the alarming news of the armed intervention being undertaken by Paris in Chad -- its largest intervention since the end of the Algerian war in 1962.

The operation, codenamed "Manta," was launched so unexpectedly and deliberately that it literally disheartened many Frenchmen. Some 2 months ago LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS writes, the authorities assured us that what was taking place in far-off Chad concerned that country alone. It was said that there was no question of intervention and that no French soldiers would be sent there. And yet now, the newspaper continues, we have 3,000 officers and men under the command of a general, and our defense minister is making an inspection visit to "frontline positions" occupied by the French subunits in Chad. At present, writes L'EXPRESS in alarm, one-third of the "Rapid Action Forces" (whose creation along the lines of the U.S. counterpart began immediately after the NATO Council session in Paris this summer -- I. Shch. note) are stationed outside France and the largest group, equipped with the latest weaponry as well as with powerful fire support and air cover facilities, is stationed in Chad.

Reporters from major French newspapers and journals and the television and radio service rushed to Ndjamena to cover the events, but they were immediately "put in their place" there by being cut off from news sources and, in particular, from the bases where the interventionist forces are deployed. After all, the authorities depicted the shipment of subunits to Chad as the sending of military instructors. However, newspaper and magazine reports from Ndjamena at first gave rise to doubts and subsequently provided grounds for believing that it was a question of a large-scale military action fraught with the most dangerous consequences and undertaken, despite all denials by Paris, under pressure from Washington.

A public opinion poll conducted at the height of the transfer of the interventionist corps to Chad showed that 53 percent of Frenchmen openly condemn this action and that almost two-thirds fear that the conflict will develop into a serious confrontation. The ruling circles are undertaking a whole series of moves designed to justify the interference and to create the impression that it is a question not of involvement in a protracted armed conflict, but of actions whose aim is merely to achieve a political settlement. Every effort is also being made to play down Washington's role in inciting France to armed interference in Chad's affairs. Attempts are being made to conceal from the public the close U.S.-French coordination in this adventure.

Addressing the National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission on 23 August, External Relations Minister C. Cheysson named the "threat to Chad from Libya" as the immediate ground for this action, but without citing a single concrete fact. He also stated that there is no direct USSR or U.S. involvement in Chad. For the Soviet Union's part that is exactly how matters stand, in fact. But, as many facts cited by Western including French media, show, with regard to the United States such an assessment is nothing but a clumsy attempt to whitewash Washington's unseemly role in fueling tension in that African country, which is in the grip of civil war, and indirectly inciting French ruling circles to armed interference.

Three days later the French head of state, repeating the accusations against Libya, was forced to acknowledge Washington's attempts to pressure Paris. Paying lip service to support for a political settlement, President F. Mitterrand made it clear that he does not rule out further participation by French troops in combat operations.

Commenting on this standpoint, observers here are noting that it is essentially a question of imposing in Chad from a position of strength a solution which suits France and the United States. By holding broad consultations with Washington on the coordination of a "common line" and after giving the "green light" to such a large-scale interventionist operation for "repulsing foreign aggression," the government did not consider it necessary to discuss with parliament the steps being taken.

It can now be seen in general terms how events around Chad have developed and what Washington's role there is. Representatives of the U.S. Administration, the newspapers recall, place Chad -- as a former French colony -- in the French "sphere of influence," but at the same time do not forget to stress that they regard it as being located in a U.S. "zone of vital interests." Washington makes no secret of the fact that armed interference in Chad's affairs is simply a component of America's far-reaching political and military-strategic plans. The creation of a new imperialist bridgehead in the center of Africa would open up new opportunities for intensifying pressure and subversive activity against developing countries, including Libya, and against national liberation movements and also for splitting the OAU.

U.S. ruling circles, LE MATIN writes, Are trying to strengthen their position in Africa, this time by embroiling France in a conflict which will inevitably lead to a worsening of relations between Paris and the countries of this region. The United States is quite happy, LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR notes, at France's assumption of the main role in the armed interference in Chad's affairs.

In the prevailing situation, LE POINT notes, the United States has important positions in Chad and H. Habre, the head of the regime, remains above all Washington's man. It was with CIA support that the current president, who had been sitting it out in Sudan, was installed in power last summer after ousting his present opponent, Oueddei, head of the Transitional Government of National Unity. Even before the arrival of the French subunits in Chad, Washington insisted on sending a corps nearly 3,000 strong there from Zaire, armed with U.S. weapons. A group of U.S. military advisers arrived in Ndjamená at the beginning of August.

Operation "Manta" was preceded by a broad and active exchange of confidential messages between Washington and Paris. According to French newspaper reports, the U.S. President has been sending messages virtually every other day. At the same time, a whole series of secret U.S.-French meetings have been held at different levels to formulate a joint position on interference in Chad's affairs. According to reports in LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR and other magazines, U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and other Pentagon representatives took part in the meetings for the U.S. side, and high-ranking officials of the Defense Ministry and presidential military advisers took part for the French side. Meanwhile, F. Mitterrand received V. Walters, R. Reagan's special envoy and former deputy director of the CIA, at his summer residence 5-7 August.

On the day of the U.S. guest's departure from Paris, the Pentagon began to transfer AWACS-equipped spyplanes to Sudan. Both on the eve of and during Operation "Manta," U.S. intelligence supplied Paris with information it was gathering. The U.S. AWACS group was withdrawn from Sudan after France deployed its own radar-equipped aircraft in Ndjamená. But the U.S. State Department announced that the U.S. aircraft would return in an emergency.

While exposing Washington's provocative role, the French press is at the same time openly indicating that in France, too, there are quite influential circles, primarily army and military-industrial circles, which from the very outset have insisted on overt military interference in Chad and have also demanded the establishment of closer cooperation with the United States and NATO.

III. 7 Sep 83

J 3

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Well-informed local observers in diplomatic circles also believe that Paris' immediate strategy consists of two alternative solutions. While maintaining and expanding its long-term military presence in Chad, France is trying by political means to achieve a beneficial solution and the strengthening of its influence in Chad from a position of strength, as well as in the light of the interests and with the support of the United States. At the same time, the partition of Chad on a "federal basis" is not ruled out. However, this long-nurtured neocolonialist idea is sharply condemned by all the conflicting political groupings in Chad. Furthermore, as French newspapers write, the number of foreign "military advisers" is at least equal to the number of the Ndjamea regime's armed forces.

If this method of achieving its goals fails, observers here are noting, Paris is ready to adopt a military solution -- which is for its own armed forces to conduct offensive operations to "liberate" the north of the country, as Washington and the influential military-political "lobby" in France itself are insisting.

There is also a third alternative which the country's left-wing democratic forces are advocating: put an end to military interference in the African state's affairs and leave the Chadians themselves to resolve their own internal problems by peaceful political means. While supporting the path of talks, the French Communists are at the same time expressing unease at the continuing French and U.S. armed interference and expanding the military presence in Chad.

A number of prominent politicians from other parties have condemned the imperialist operation. They include, in particular, M. Jobert, former foreign minister and a member of the P. Mauroy government's previous cabinet. He has sharply condemned Washington's provocative role in the Chad conflict, which he has termed U.S. blackmail. The newspaper LE MATIN has published an interview with an officer of the Ndjamea regime's armed forces. "Tell French people," he said, "that we do not want war. It is not necessary to send us any more weapons."

FRANCE DEFENDS OWN, U.S. INTERESTS IN CHAD

LD052238 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Sep 83

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Excerpt] In places where the formation of nations has not yet been completed, ethnic differences are expressed and surface in the form of intertribal confrontations. This tribalism is especially characteristic of Africa. It is even called the bete noir of the African Continent. These intertribal contradictions, interwoven with economic, religious, and social contradictions, are to be seen in virtually all conflicts, and the conflict now taking place in Chad is no exception. This conflict has many facets, many dimensions. Today, I would like to dwell on just one: the role of France, and France's policy in connection with the events in Chad.

As is known, France was one of the main colonial powers in Africa. The French left behind them 26 Francophone states. Moreover, having ceased to be formally the parent state, France continued to consider itself the boss in many of those countries, and went on actively interfering in African affairs. In the 1960's and 1970's France played a more or less noticeable military role in conflicts, for instance, in Cameroon, Zaire, Djibouti, Gabon, the Comores, Chad, and the Central African Republic. Sometimes it even seemed that Paris was flaunting its readiness to play the role of African gendarme.

The French Socialists, both when they were struggling for power and when they came to power, spoke and acted decisively against neocolonialism, against interference, especially armed interference, in the affairs of African countries.

But here is the first serious test -- Chad is the first serious test -- and Paris fails it. Mitterrand is acting completely in the spirit of Giscard d'Estaing and Pompidou.

Well, I shall not say anything about the factual side of the matter, it is well known to you. Let us look at the arguments by which Paris tries to justify its actions. The first argument sounds like this: France is defending its role and its interests in Africa; France is responsible for equilibrium in Africa. Well, one can hardly argue with the fact that France has considerable economic and political interests in Africa; they really do exist. But to refer to these interests, to France's responsibility, means making use of typical colonialist logic, the typical approach of a parent state to settling peripheral colonial affairs.

In their second argument they talk about France's special treaty responsibilities. Well, let us say, France really does have a treaty with Chad, signed on 3 March 1976. However, this treaty provides, if we are talking about military aspects, only for instruction and material-technical aid. Sending large formations of troops equipped with powerful weapons is not provided for in the treaty. They well know this in Paris, of course, and Mitterrand offers this elegant formula: France, he said, is expanding the framework of the treaty. But any lawyer would say that de facto expansion of the obligations fixed in law means in practice violation of those obligations.

The third argument: France is responding to an appeal from the Chad Government. Well, this is true in a way, because Hisssein Habre really did appeal repeatedly to France for help, and moreover he repeatedly called on the French to take an active part in military operations. But the whole point is that the legitimacy of the Habre government gives rise -- to put it mildly -- to great doubts. The government of Goukouni Oueddei, formed on the basis of the Lagos agreements, was the last legitimate Government of Chad. Habre raised a revolt against that government, and came to power using force. That means that Paris is in fact helping rebels.

There is another argument; true, they prefer not to recall it on an official level, and even (?renounce) it. Here is what LE MONDE writes, for example: At the basis of the French interference lies the fear that French allies in Africa will consider U.S. help more reliable than French help. On the same thought in another version: I think Jobert, former French foreign minister, has said, that the French interference in Chad was provoked by the United States, which exerted pressure on the African countries so that they would turn to France for aid. Well, Paris as befits Paris, is insisting on the independence of its actions. But it is difficult to reject the impression that in this case Paris has found itself in the shadow of U.S. policy.

So how does it turn out? It turns out that France is defending its own interests plus the interests of the United States in Africa. It turns out further that it is doing this in violation of a treaty it signed itself. And finally, it turns out that it is helping forces which are in opposition to the legitimate Government of Chad.

That is how matters stand with the arguments. As you can see, they are fairly vulnerable to criticism. But let us get away for the moment from formal logic and return to the essence of the matter. In Paris they say: We went into Chad not to fight; we went into Chad to stop Libya and to create conditions for a peaceful political settlement of the conflict. And moreover it is not we who should resolve it, but the Africans. That is what they say in Paris.

In general, I believe that the French do not want to fight. Francois Mitterrand, the U.S. weekly NEWSWEEK recently said spitefully, sent the troops into Chad with about the same enthusiasm as a connoisseur of expensive wines pours out a cheap port. Well, pouring it out is nothing, it is only half a tragedy, but if you have to drink it? And events there could take a most unexpected turn; they might have to shoot and count bodies. It is not by chance that LE FIGARO observed: France finds itself in a situation in Chad which is reminiscent of the United States in Vietnam.

French officials give assurances that the French soldiers will only fight if they are attacked, they will only defend themselves. Well, this is interesting; this reasoning coincides exactly with Reagan's reasoning. He said this: U.S. forces -- Reagan wrote to Congress -- are prepared to use their right to self-defense if anybody tries to attack them. That was about Lebanon; incidentally, there are 2,000 French soldiers there. They have not fought, but 12 have already been killed and 38 wounded. Somehow this has brought no noticeable improvement of affairs in Lebanon. But, you see, sending multinational forces there was, as it happens, motivated by the desire to improve the situation in that country. But the opposite is what has happened, and it could not have been otherwise.

Let us return to Chad. Suppose, finally, that a political settlement, of the type Paris wants, is achieved. But so long as it is achieved with the presence of 3,000 French soldiers, then it is hardly likely to hold for long after their departure, and that is the whole point.

Well, remember the advice Korney Ivanovich Chukovskiy once gave: Children, don't go to Africa for a stroll. Children are obeying Korney Ivanovich, but things are not so good with the adults.

CPSU DELEGATION'S TALKS IN DAR ES SALAAM NOTED

PM020848 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "High Assessment"]

[Text] Dar es Salaam, 30 Aug -- J. Nyerere, chairman of the Revolutionary Party of Tanzania (CCM) and president of the United Republic of Tanzania, received the CPSU delegation led by G.P. Bogomyakov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Tyumen CPSU Obkom, which is here on the invitation of the CCM.

In the course of the talks, the CPSU delegation informed the Tanzanian leadership of the tireless activity of the Soviet party and government aimed at preserving peace and the peoples' security. The Tanzanian president gave a high assessment of the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy and announced his support for the constructive new initiatives put forward by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, in his replies to questions from PRAVDA.

There was also an exchange of views on the African situation in the light of the increasing aggressive actions on the continent by the forces of imperialism led by the United States. The CCM chairman expressed himself in favor of a further development of ties between the CPSU and the CCM, friendly Soviet-Tanzanian relations, and cooperation in various spheres. The CPSU delegation left for home today.

WEINBERGER C. AMERICA TRIP TO 'ESCALATE' WAR

LD061659 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1835 GMT 5 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Igor Fesunenکو]

[Text] The explosive situation in Central America, pushed to the limits by Washington's efforts, is to get another stimulatory shock. The very person of Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, intends to go and see Panama, El Salvador and Honduras on 6 and 7 September.

He is setting off there to inspect personally the provocation against Nicaragua, unprecedented in scale, tension, hysteria and in the volume of military technology used, undertaken in the guise of U.S.-Honduran military maneuvers. At a recent news conference in the Pentagon, the defense secretary held forth with disarming frankness and unmasked cynicism on the motives and reasons for his trip.

I love being where the troops are and the operations in Honduras are extremely important. I want to meet the officials on the spot with whom we will cooperate in the course of the planned maneuvers, particularly the defense ministers of El Salvador and Honduras. I want to have a word with the soldiers and see what their mood is, Weinberger said. I consider this extremely valuable and I like this. I did this in the FRG, too, and every time it gives me pleasure.

So, suddenly beneath the civilian clothes of this particularly civilian official -- since 1945 when he left the Army with the rank of captain until his appointment as defense secretary in the Reagan cabinet, Weinberger has had nothing at all to do with the military -- the heart of a man and not of a boy is suddenly revealed: a lover of sharp emotions and feats of arms.

Mr Weinberger likes it where there are a lot of troops and the racket of shooting, where the smell of gunpowder smoke tickles the nose unpleasantly and the eyes seek the sights of bloodshed. So Mr Weinberger will certainly be pleased at the numbers of victims of the El Salvador puppet regime, approaching 40,000 in the past 4 years. And of course, it is to increase the production of the Salvadoran meat grinder and step up the guerilla war against Nicaragua that the U.S. defense secretary is setting off on his latest trip.

The results of the trip will be an escalation of the undeclared war against Nicaragua and a further increase in U.S. military aid to Honduras and to the Salvadoran regime. No, there is no doubt that the appearance of the defense secretary at the head of the U.S. military concentrated off the coast of Nicaragua will lead to an even greater whipping up of psychosis and hysteria, provocations and threats.

But in order to justify this crude pressure on the sovereign state, in order to attach a semblance of, well if not legitimacy, at least some grounds for this aggression against Nicaragua, Washington and its environs continues to blow mythical soap bubbles about Cuban military advisors and even of Cuban troops in Nicaragua which, if Reagan and his subordinates are to be believed, constitute a most serious threat to U.S. security. This slanderous propaganda campaign is being conducted so clumsily, that different Washington departments did not even consider it necessary to agree among themselves on the figures for this threat of militant Cubans and Nicaraguans looming over the United States.

For example, the Pentagon publishes the figure of 3,500 Cuban military advisors in Nicaragua. The Central Intelligence Agency, 5,500; and Jeane Kirkpatrick, yet another one who loves sharp militaristic sensations and who for some reason considers herself a great expert on Latin American problems, raised this figure, as if in an auction, to 6,000.

Fidel Castro supplied an answer to the shameless manipulators. In a recent interview with a group of U.S. journalists, he reported that the number of Cuban advisors working in Nicaragua at the request of the government of this country is no more than 200 -- not 200,000 but 200 persons. Fidel Castro again confirmed the readiness of the Cuban leadership to agree with the other sides involved on measures to lower tension in the region, particularly on the withdrawal, on conditions of reciprocity, of military advisors from Central American states. The Nicaraguan leadership, too, has repeatedly expressed its readiness for talks. But Washington pretends that it does not hear these statements, it does not respond to them.

Washington continues to escalate the threats because this pleases Mr Weinberger, because this brings pleasure to President Reagan and to the bigwigs of the military-industrial complex standing at his side.

CUBAN REBELS SEEN AS 'CIA SECRET ARMY'

LD062054 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] Washington September 6 TASS -- President Reagan has untied the hands of U.S. special services, specifically the Central Intelligence Agency, for dirty operations against Cuba, Nicaragua, and other countries of Latin America. It should be noted that after Ronald Reagan came to the White House, the Cuban counter-revolutionaries based in the USA begin to feel "at home". It is not for nothing that the American press refers to them as a secret CIA army. Precisely the CIA is playing patron to the counter-revolutionaries who fled Cuba and uses them for subversive operations against the first socialist country in the Western Hemisphere.

Omega-7, Alfa-66, Condor, Cubanos Unidos, and many other Cuban counter-revolutionary organisations operating in the USA regard the brutal terrorist act -- the explosion of a plane belonging to the Cubana de Aviacion Airline in the area of Barbados in 1976, which took the lives of many people -- as an example worthy of following. The investigation revealed that the terrorist act was staged with the knowledge and assistance of the CIA which supplied the terrorists with forged documents and a bomb that can be found only in the arsenals of the U.S. Army and U.S. intelligence services.

Somozista thugs, trained and armed by the CIA, are now stealthily making their way into Nicaragua's territory with similar bombs. The CIA used Cuban counter-revolutionaries to sabotage a plane of the Nicaraguan airline, Aeronica, in Mexico City in January 1981. Omar Torrijos, head of the Panamanian Government, died in an air crash the same year. Latin American press published many reports on the incident testifying that the crash was a result of an act of sabotage, and that the prominent Panamanian figure whose independent policies had long caused Washington's resentment, was a victim of a criminal CIA plot.

Assassinations, acts of sabotage and terrorism are the favorite methods of the CIA. The same is true of the Cuban counter-revolutionaries. They avidly greeted the election of Ronald Reagan, especially popular among them for his fervent anti-communism, President of the USA. E. Fabian, one of the ring-leaders of a Cuban counter-revolutionary organisation boasted that his henchmen would enjoy an absolute freedom of action in the USA. Speaking in a NEW YORK TIMES interview, he said that Washington had admitted that the efforts of Cuban counter-revolutionaries came in line with the interests of the USA. It was a trenchant remark. Really, the President and the counter-revolutionaries have the same aims. They said that they were fighting to topple the government in Havana. President Reagan says almost the same. Just recall his fervent anti-Cuban and anti-communist speech in Miami when he emphasised that his administration would intensify hostile activities against Cuba. In circumvention of U.S. laws, Cuban counter-revolutionaries are undergoing combat training in U.S. territory, getting ready for a new "crusade" against Cuba. They are acting openly, enjoying the patronage of the White House, including President Reagan himself.

KAPITONOV ATTENDS MOSCOW BOOK FAIR OPENING

LD061622 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] The Moscow International Book Fair Exhibition opened today. For the fourth time, gathered in Moscow are the creators and distributors of press productions from nearly 90 countries. The scale of the exhibition is impressive -- it is a whole book township covering 25,000 square meters. On the stands are 180,000 books, music scores, maps, atlases, stamps and other kinds of printing products, graphically demonstrating the riches and variety of modern spiritual culture.

The opening ceremony was attended by Comrades Kapitonov, Arkhipov, Stukalin, Shauro, Pastukhov, Menteshashviliy, and leaders of a number of ministries and departments, representatives of major publishing organizations and firms of many countries, cultural and science figures, and heads of diplomatic missions accredited to the USSR.

CPSU TIGHTENING DISCIPLINE, EFFICIENCY STANDARDS

PM051123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Setting an Example of Discipline and Efficiency"]

[Excerpts] There is an old saying that the stiffer the task, the greater the honor. It is a high honor to be a communist. But it is also a heavy responsibility. It increases as the scale of the leadership activities of Lenin's party increases and as the tasks being tackled in the process of improving developed socialism become more complex.

The CPSU has now made doing everything possible to tighten discipline, organization, and order one of its top priorities. The steps it is taking are meeting with Soviet people's broad support and are having a beneficial effect on the results of the people's economic management and all their creative activity. The success of further effort in this sphere depends largely on communists, since what is involved here is not a brief campaign but sustained painstaking work designed to foster a climate of heightened exactingness and responsibility in every labor collective.

"Party members must lead the way when it comes to labor discipline and drive," V.I. Lenin said. This precept acquires new meaning at the contemporary stage, when there is an urgent need to substantially increase economic efficiency. What is the top priority now? It is, above all, to make the fullest possible use of internal production reserves in order to accelerate the intensification of production and increase labor productivity. Party members must direct their labor energy and professional skill and experience toward this.

Of course, like anyone else, communists appreciate attention being paid to their successes. Personal achievements and records set at one's workbench, on a construction site, or out in the fields are not for them an end in itself, however. They must be just as concerned to ensure other people's work is going well. It is, for example, not a matter of indifference to them why their workmates fail to fulfill their norms. Maybe they are unqualified or new to the job? If so, communists will generously share their professional "secrets." Or are they merely work shy?

If so, you can be sure that a communist will not be indifferent to this and keep quiet....

At the same time those who are guilty of personal indiscipline and perform their production or official duties in a shipshod manner are called strictly to account. It is absolutely fundamental that such behavior be viewed as nothing less than a breach of regulations. The attitude of certain employees, including leaders, who have resigned themselves to poor discipline and who try to hide the "fruits" of mismanagement and substitute futile logomachy and ostensible exactingness for exhaustive measures is resolutely condemned.

Nor when thoroughly analyzing the state of affairs do communists have the right to pass over in silence the occasional cases of the party's call for tighter discipline being interpreted in a one-sided manner. It is no secret that sometimes the whole thing is reduced merely to the management vigilantly monitoring "from when to when" people are present in the shop or office, forgetting to show any interest in how they make use of the working time, what their output is and whether or not the requisite conditions for highly productive labor have been created. Absenteeism must, of course, be combated, but you must not stop there. The most important and fundamental thing here is to ensure that every person works conscientiously and values every hour and minute of work.

It is imperative that the steps taken with a view to tightening discipline be underpinned by well organized ideological and political education work, that formalism and ostentation be tenaciously combated, and that such work be geared entirely to practical requirements. As Comrade Yu.V. Andropov pointed out at his meeting at the CPSU Central Committee with party veterans, it is absolutely imperative that this work is based on modern labor organization, intelligent manpower deployment, efficient material and technical backup, and improvement of the many and varied forms and means of moral and material incentive.

Party organizations have a vast arsenal of proven methods of developing communists' sense of responsibility. This is a sure guarantee of the further intensification of their efforts to foster a climate of good organization and order in labor collectives. By strengthening the unity of word and deed and setting a personal example, may every communist make a still greater contribution to the fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums!

BRIEFS

NEW LITHUANIAN CITY -- A new city has gone up in Lithuania, also in the Baltic. It has been named Snieckus for an eminent Lithuanian statesman, and will be the home of people working at the atomic electric power station that's going up nearby. Together with the atomic power station, the thermal and hydro-electric power stations that are also in construction stage at present, will make Lithuania a supplier of electricity to other parts of the country. This year electric power output is to double in Lithuania.
[Text] [Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 31 Aug 83 LD]

ORDER OF LABOR RED BANNER -- By a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Filipp Timofeyevich Yermash, chairman of the USSR State Committee of Cinematography, has been awarded the Order of Labor Red Banner for services to the Communist Party and the Soviet state and in connection with his 60th birthday. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1904 GMT 3 Sep 83 LD]

HIGHER PAY FOR TECHNICAL WORKERS DISCUSSED

LD030509 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 2 Sep 83

[Text] In accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers decision, an experiment in improving payment for the labor of workers in construction and technological organizations and their subdivisions is being undertaken at five Leningrad enterprises: the Izhorskiy works, Elektrosila, Leningrad Metallicheskiy works, the Nevskiy Lenin works, and the Leningrad electromechanical works.

A conference on the course of the experiment took place today in Leningrad. It was stressed that the first results show the broad potential possibilities for the growth of labor productivity of engineering-technical workers and increasing their influence on raising the technical level and quality of goods produced.

Comrades Antonov and Marchuk, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Comrade Zaykov, first secretary of the Leningrad obkom, spoke at the conference.

DISPROPORTION SEEN IN PRODUCTIVITY, REMUNERATION

LD052007 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Sep 83

[From the Vremya newscast, video commentary by political observer L.A. Voznesenskiy]

[Text] The recent session of Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee discussed the question of intensifying work towards ensuring a greater rate of growth of labor productivity in comparison with the growth of work remuneration.

[Begin Voznesenskiy video recording] Hello, comrades. It is known that the tasks concerning the growth of labor productivity in the national economy are not being fulfilled in full, while those concerning the growth of labor remuneration are being met, or nearly met. This specifically means that less goods than envisaged are being produced while the money paid out is approximately as much as planned, or even more. In effect, each ruble is equivalent to a smaller product aggregate. This is one of the reasons for shortages and various attendant abnormal phenomena. Their very source, as can be seen, is in the fact that there has been an influx of, as it were, "paper" or unearned money into the turnover of the national economy, money which has been received over and above the achieved labor productivity. In consequence then, one may say, we live better than we work. However, this situation cannot persist in the economy for long without punishment.

There are economic laws which society must observe in order to exist and develop. One of these laws is the planned proportionate development of the national economy. Not infrequently, however, this proportionate development is abused, including one of its most important ratios: the ratio between the rate of labor productivity grown and the rate of work remuneration growth.

We have many enterprises that work very well indeed. There are whole industries where this ratio is being correctly observed. However, this is not yet the case everywhere. Therefore, there are fewer possibilities for speeding up the development of production, building new housing, or improving the general living standard of the population at the same rate or on the same scale as envisaged in the plans. The result is that every minute's gain made by the individual or by the collective -- due to receiving money in excess to what they have in fact earned -- this gain in the end begins to work against them and against the other members of society.

Some people may misunderstand this and think we are talking about cutting labor remuneration. By no means. In our country labor remuneration has been growing and will continue to grow. Now it averages 1.5 times higher than in 1970. We are only talking of speeding up the growth of labor productivity, which in turn will raise the remuneration for labor. But this must not be a blown-up growth of labor productivity on paper only, on account of some manipulation of price indexes. It must be expressed first of all through increasing the real volume of material goods and increasing their quality. It must be based on scientific-technical progress, on improved organization of production and labor, on establishing order and discipline in the national economy.

It is no accident that this year, for the first time in a long while, and in connection with the measures adopted by the party towards strengthening order and discipline and speeding up the growth of labor productivity, the ratio between the growth rate of labor productivity and the growth rate of the average labor remuneration for blue and white collar workers has approached the planned level.

Remuneration for labor must be earned. This is not just a problem concerning the moral health of the individual and the collective, but a problem concerning the economic health of society. Thus it is a problem of ensuring stable and speedy development of the national economy and a steady rise of living standards. [end recording]

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS ADOPTS DECISION ON ENERGY

LD070123 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 6 Sep 83

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers had adopted a decision on additional measures to raise the efficiency of management of heat and power engineering [teplo-energeticheskoye khozyaystvo] of towns and other points of population.

The decision maps out measures on the rational enlargement of sources of thermal energy, the gradual elimination of small, uneconomic boiler houses, and raising the level of mechanization and automation in the work of heat supply systems. In the years ahead measures are to be implemented to reduce fuel expenditure on heat supply by reducing the number of small boiler houses. It was specified that town heat supply plans are to be drawn up. The construction and expansion of boiler houses not provided for in these plans are prohibited.

BRIEFS

URENGOY-UZHGOROD PIPELINE COMPLETED -- According to Aleksey Ivanovich Sorokin, USSR deputy minister of construction of petroleum and gas industry enterprises, the construction of the 4,451-km Urengoy-Uzhgorod gas pipeline has been successfully completed. The entire system has been tested and completely filled with gas. [Summary] [Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1700 GMT 27 Aug 83 AU] On 27 August, or nearly 5 months ahead of schedule, Urengoy gas reached the gas compressing station in the border area near Uzhgorod. An international meeting held in this occasion at the station was attended by representatives of Soviet, Polish, and GDR workers who were engaged in the Carpathian Mountains. [Summary] [Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0230 GMT 28 Aug 83 AU]

SELSKAYA ZHIZN SURVEYS FEED HARVEST PROGRESS

PM050811 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Sep 83 p 1

["Agricultural Review" compiled by USSR Ministry of Agriculture: "Tapping All Feed Reserves"]

[Text] According to the USSR Central Statistical Administration, as of 29 August kolkhozes and sovkhoses had procured 68.5 million metric tons of hay, 63.4 million metric tons of haylage, and 61.5 million metric tons of silage, and produced 6.2 million metric tons of artificially dehydrated green feed, including 5.5 million metric tons of grass meal. Translated into feed units 81.4 million metric tons of coarse and succulent feed has been procured -- an average of 9.5 quintals per nominal head of livestock (excluding hogs and poultry).

Reserves of such feed increased by 7.1 million metric tons of feed units in the week under review. The harvesting of grasses is still proceeding. Silage procurement is underway everywhere, and 18.5 million metric tons of this feed -- some 5.7 million more than in the previous week -- were procured in the review period. The 57 million hectares of straw gathered -- 73 percent of the area of grain crops threshed -- are being stacked.

Here is how some feed procurement indicators look in the union republics:

Union Republics	Second and Subsequent Cuts (as a percentage of area of first cut)	Straw Pro- cured (as percentage of area threshed)	Coarse and Succulent Feed Procured per Nominal Head (quintals of feed units)	Total Up or Down
RSFSR	6.2	72	9.4	plus 1.5
Ukrainian SSR	45.1	99.5	8.1	plus 1.0
Belorussian SSR	38.1	92	11.9	plus 1.7
Uzbek SSR	292.5	90	12.2	plus 0.9
Kazakh SSR	1.5	39	10.1	plus 2.5
Georgian SSR	9.0	86	6.9	plus 0.4
Azerbaijan SSR	67.5	97	11.2	plus 0.3
Lithuanian SSR	22.9	96	14.4	plus 3.0
Moldavian SSR	127.9	97	7.6	minus 0.6
Latvian SSR	6.3	80	11.8	plus 1.7
Kirghiz SSR	28.8	78	8.5	plus 2.4
Tajik SSR	50.9	90	10.6	plus 1.4
Armenian SSR	7.4	79	10.0	plus 0.4
Turkmen SSR	370.3	100	8.9	plus 0.2
Estonian SSR	27.9	77	13.3	plus 2.6

A number of oblasts in the RSFSR and Kazakhstan are behind with the second cut. There is still a lot of straw in the fields of kolkhozes and sovkhoses in Kazakhstan and the RSFSR's West Siberian and Urals regions. Coarse feed still has to be gathered from almost 1/2 of the area of grain crops threshed in Kostroma, Kalinin, Pskov, and Yaroslavl Oblasts. Farm leaders in these oblasts have not drawn the correct conclusion from the lessons of previous years, when straw has been brought in from other republics and oblasts at great cost in terms of manpower and material, technical, and financial resources.

Winter and spring straw, chaff, and tailings are an important reserve for replenishing coarse feed stocks. It is therefore imperative to create a carryover reserve of this feed and to ensure that it is well preserved. Leading farms are treating it with anhydrous ammonia in order to increase its food value and improve its keeping qualities. This increases the digestibility of the cellulose and the feed's protein content. The straw's anhydrous ammonia prevents the spread of mold and putrefactive processes in the stack and rodent infestation.

Extensive use is made of anhydrous ammonia to treat coarse feed by farms in Kalinin, Kursk, Moscow, Penza, Tula, Kiev, Cherkassy, and a number of other oblasts. The straw is treated by specially created detachments of the All-Union Science-and-Production Association for Agrochemical Services to Agriculture furnished with the necessary equipment. Since the start of the year they have already treated more than 1.4 million metric tons of coarse feed.

Reserves of coarse and succulent feed can also be substantially replenished from other waste products from field-crop and vegetable farming and from enterprises processing agricultural raw materials. Every farm has a considerable quantity of raw material which must be more fully utilized for feed production. In many places potato, sugar-beet and feed beet tops, cabbage leaves, and other waste products valuable for feed are used when ensiling green feed. Thus, on the Kirov and Chernyakhovskiy Kolkhozes in Kursk Oblast's Oktyabrskiy and Kurskiy Rayons, substandard cucumbers and squashes brought in from local processing enterprises go in with corn cobs, root crops, and alfalfa to make mixed silage.

In addition to creating a sufficient quantity of coarse and succulent feed, it is equally important to ensure that it is fully preserved. Checks show that feed storage is being poorly monitored on a number of farms. Haystacks and ricks are not being rearranged following precipitation, and rainwater is seeping into hollows which have formed in them, causing the feed to spoil. Haystacks are often not fenced off or plowed round, giving livestock free access to them.

Every farm must immediately organize checks on feed storage and eliminate existing shortcomings, and also see to it that feed is protected against fire and theft.

CSA REPORTS RYAZAN OBLAST GRAIN CROP FULFILLMENT

LD052233 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 Sep 83

[Text] Implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress, CPSU Central Committee plenums, and the Food Program, agricultural workers of Ryazan Oblast fulfilled the plan for the sale of grain crops to the state. According to the Central Statistical Administration of the USSR, 629,000 metric tons of grain crops were delivered to reception centers. The plan for the procurement of wheat has been overfulfilled; the plan for the sale of bean crops has not been fulfilled. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the oblast have provided themselves with seed for next year's harvest. The farms are continuing the harvesting and sale to the state of buckwheat and millet.

SCIENCE ACADEMY PRESIDENT DISCUSSES ACHIEVEMENTS

LD051827 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 5 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS -- "Along many directions Soviet science is now up to the world standard", it was stated by Anatoliy Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He spoke today at a press conference on the eve of the opening of the international exhibition "Nauka-83" (Science-83).

"A number of new principles elaborated by Soviet scientists are finding extensive application in the whole world", the academician noted. "This concerns both fundamental and applied sciences".

"It is known that at a certain stage there was a lag in biology", Anatoliy Aleksandrov said. "Now this science has made considerable advances in the USSR and has attained a sufficiently high level. Soviet scientists have achieved considerable successes in molecular biology, genetics, and gene engineering. It should also be added that in practical terms all studies in this field were conducted with the use of Soviet instruments".

"The Soviet Union comes out for extensive international cooperation in science and technology", academician Aleksandrov said. "It should be based on equality and reciprocity and facilitate the progress of science and technology in the whole world. The joint projects by Soviet scientists and their colleagues from other socialist countries are a good example of the fruitfulness of this cooperation: lately they obtained excellent results also in the field of automation, computer technology, and instrument-making".

"The American Administration's actions directed at scaling down scientific and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union and banning the delivery to the USSR of a whole number of types of technology and equipment can in no way affect the development of Soviet science", Anatoliy Aleksandrov stressed. "The USSR's successes in the nuclear field and rocketry were achieved without help from anybody and this proves that our country has such a scientific-technical potential that allows it to solve any problems and tasks".

BRIEFS

RIGA TELEVISION, RADIO COMPLEX -- Construction of the new republican television and radio complex is continuing on Zaku Island in Riga. Its transmission antenna will be 386 m high. This new project is unique because of its architectural and technical features. The two buildings will accommodate over 900 rooms, including two television studios with a floorspace of 600 and 450 square meters respectively and a large concert hall. Advice on construction is being provided by specialists from the Ostankino television center in Moscow, the Kiev Paton Institute of Welding, and other scientific and design organizations in the country. The first stage of the complex will be commissioned towards the end of the current 5-year plan. [Excerpts] [Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Sep 83 LD]